United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 166 WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, JUNE 26, 2020 *No. 118*

Senate

The Senate was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Monday, June 29, 2020, at 3 p.m.

House of Representatives

FRIDAY, JUNE 26, 2020

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BEYER).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
June 26, 2020.

I hereby appoint the Honorable DONALD S. BEYER, Jr. to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, thank You for giving us another day.

Have mercy upon us, O God, as the ravages of the coronavirus are spreading still in many States nationwide.

Bless and comfort those who suffer from this disease; give them healing. Bless and comfort those who mourn the loss of loved ones in the wake of COVID–19.

Inspire those professionals whose life's work is healthcare, those who care for the sick, and those who labor to find treatments and cures to diseases as they emerge and begin their own effort to survive. Help us to love You, and one another, for we know that You work all things together for the good of those who do so.

In our communities throughout the country, continue to bless governments, citizens, and police with a spirit of respect and cooperation. May peace might descend upon all, that neighbors, and those in service to them, can look forward together to a more prosperous future.

Bless the people's House, and may all that is done be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 4(a) of House Resolution 967, the Journal of the last day's proceedings is approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to five requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

CONGRATULATING ZACK EARP

(Mr. TAKANO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate a dear friend and community member, Zack Earp, on receiving the Riverside Spirit Award.

Zack was a longtime educator and Marine veteran who saw combat in Vietnam.

Despite the health challenges he has faced, Zack continues to serve actively in our community by working with local volunteers, advocating for local students, and volunteering with the Boy Scouts.

Zack has inspired so many people, including me, with his positive attitude and his will to make our community a better place for all.

Zack has dedicated his life to service and to activism, and we are lucky to have him in Riverside.

Zack is deserving of this award, and I am glad that the Riverside City Council is recognizing such an outstanding citizen.

CONGRATULATING MAJOR GENERAL JON JENSEN

(Mr. STAUBER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STAUBER. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to stand here today and congratulate Major General Jon Jensen of the Minnesota National Guard on his recent nomination to become the next Director of the Army National Guard.

Major General Jensen is a proven leader with an extraordinary record of

service to the great State of Minnesota and our Nation.

Currently, Major General Jensen serves as the adjutant general of the Minnesota National Guard, meaning that he is the highest ranking guardsman in our State. Major General Jensen has also held numerous other leadership positions during his 37 years with the National Guard.

Throughout his entire career, Major General Jensen has served with the highest level of dedication. His service has earned him the respect of the public; countless government officials; and, most importantly, his fellow guardsmen.

On behalf of the entire State of Minnesota, I thank Major General Jon Jensen for his service and congratulate him on this well-deserved nomination.

Major General Jensen's rich experience makes him the perfect fit for the position, and I look forward to seeing him confirmed by the United States Senate soon.

SENATE MUST PASS JUSTICE IN POLICING ACT

(Ms. MENG asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. MENG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today because our Nation is screaming out, grieving for those killed by police brutality and racial injustice.

I rise today because, for 8 minutes and 46 seconds, a police officer pressed his knee on George Floyd's neck, slowly killing him, but we know there are countless more who will forever remain faceless and nameless because their stories were never recorded.

I rise today because Black lives matter.

Last night, I proudly voted to pass this historic, transformative bill, the Justice in Policing Act.

This bill would finally put in place unprecedented and bold reforms to curb police brutality and racial profiling and combat the epidemic of racial injustice.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot turn our backs on the cries for justice. We cannot go back to a system that would look the other way when faced with police brutality.

The Senate must follow the House's lead and immediately pass this bill because this moment of national anguish demands nothing less.

HONORING THE LIFE OF ROBERT BOATRIGHT

(Mr. CARTER of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember and honor the life of Mr. Roger Boatright of Alma, Georgia, who passed away on May 8.

Roger was a remarkable man of great courage, leadership, and depth, and I had the honor and privilege of knowing him well.

Roger retired from the Georgia State Patrol as a trooper first class and was a faithful member to his church and numerous community organizations, such as the Bacon County Exchange Club; the Bacon County Hospital Authority; and the Georgia Municipal Association, to which he served as president.

When Roger was elected as a council member for the city of Alma in 1986, this paved the course of his life of service to his community.

A few years later, Roger was elected mayor of Alma, where he faithfully served 14 years. In 2009, he was elected chairman of the Bacon County Board of Commissioners and later returned to serve as a council member for the city of Alma.

While tremendously improving his city as mayor, he was appointed to the board of the Georgia Department of Community Affairs before he became chair of this statewide board.

Roger was truly a pillar in his community, which is why he was rightfully rewarded various accolades.

Although Roger had a passion for service and loved his community deeply, he loved his family more than anything.

I am thankful for the lasting impact Roger had on so many, including myself, and I know his legacy and influence will remain for years to come.

My thoughts and prayers are with all who worked with him, knew him, and loved him. Southeast Georgia has lost a great man.

DEMOCRATS REMAIN COMMITTED TO STRENGTHENING HEALTHCARE

(Mr. CICILLINE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, the House will vote on the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Enhancement Act, a bill that will lower healthcare costs and prescription drug costs, protect patients with preexisting conditions, expand Medicaid, and lower prescription drug costs.

Democrats have been committed since the day we arrived here to strengthening access to quality healthcare.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle, on the other hand, are trying to rip away healthcare from 20 million Americans and weaken protection for 135 million Americans with preexisting conditions.

They have been trying to do this for 10 years. They are obsessed with the very idea.

Yesterday, President Trump joined 18 Republican Governors and attorneys general in filing a brief in the United States Supreme Court to have the entire Affordable Care Act declared unconstitutional in the middle of a global health pandemic. More than 40 million Americans have filed for unemployment; 120,000 Americans have died; and more than 2.25 million Americans have been infected with this virus. There has never been a more important time to protect access to quality, affordable healthcare than right now.

That is why Democrats are going to move forward with another bill that will further strengthen access to high-quality, affordable healthcare. It is important that we continue this fight to protect the American people and their access to healthcare.

RECOGNIZING 70TH ANNIVERSARY OF KOREAN WAR

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, yesterday marked the 70th anniversary of the Korean war. On June 25, 1950, at 4 a.m., the North Korean army mercilessly crossed the 38th parallel with 135,000 troops to begin the invasion of the South.

This anniversary is an opportunity to especially remember the 326,863 Americans who served and the 36,574 who died to successfully stop communist imperialism.

I am grateful that President Donald Trump and First Lady Melania Trump provided a wreath at the extraordinary Korean War Veterans Memorial on The Mall yesterday in Washington.

There is no greater contrast between the blessings of democratic capitalism, with South Korea being one of the world's wealthiest nations as North Korea's totalitarian socialist regime has mass poverty.

Korea is well represented in Washington by Ambassador Lee Soo-hyuck, and Korean Americans are valued citizens.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

HONORING THE LIFE OF REVEREND MAGGIE HOWARD

(Mr. ROSE of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ROSE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with an incredibly heavy heart to honor the life of my dear friend, Reverend Maggie Howard, a woman whose kind soul is impossible to describe in just this 1 minute that I have.

From her Stapleton UAME Church on Tompkins Avenue on Staten Island, Reverend Howard led a ministry of service that was impossible to miss.

Through her soup kitchen and pantry, she not only opened the doors of her church; she opened her heart and soul to anyone in need. When others might see someone homeless or suffering and look the other way, no, Maggie would offer them a meal or even a job.

That love for her community earned her the nickname Stapleton's Mother

Teresa, and it was her fierce spirit that allowed her to overcome so many challenges in her life, including fighting through her own health struggles.

I know that all of Staten Island is feeling the pain of losing Reverend Howard this young, but I want to close out with words of optimism that were near and dear to her heart: ''No matter what happened yesterday, tomorrow can be better if we start today.''

Today, Staten Islanders are going to come together to honor and celebrate Reverend Howard's life, and we will never forget her memory.

RECOGNIZING NATIONAL PTSD AWARENESS MONTH

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize June as National PTSD Awareness Month, and this Saturday, June 27, as PTSD Awareness Day.

We need to do more to defy the stigmas surrounding mental health. PTSD treatment is a crucial tool that helps many individuals, particularly our Nation's veterans, process, cope, and treat emotional and mental trauma.

Sadly, many of the men and women who have served in the United States military return home with injuries and scars, but sometimes, it is the invisible scars that hurt the most. Many struggle privately with PTSD and feel there is no outlet.

PTSD Awareness Month is not only an opportunity to raise awareness about this, but it is also an opportunity to raise awareness about treatment options.

The Department of Veterans Affairs offers a variety of resources to help those suffering from PTSD. Those seeking treatment should know that telemedicine may be an option as well, ensuring our veterans receive timely healthcare no matter where they live.

Mr. Speaker, I thank our Nation's veterans for their service, and I encourage those who are struggling with PTSD to pursue treatment.

CONGRESS CANNOT STOP HERE

(Ms. TLAIB asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. TLAIB. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise in support of the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act. The measures in this bill are long overdue and are a step forward in ensuring people, especially Black folks in our country, do not experience racist police violence.

We can't stop here, though, Mr. Speaker. I think about Aiyana Stanley-Jones, a young girl in Detroit who would be graduating from high school this year if she had not been murdered by police when they raided her home, the wrong home, while she slept in 2010.

We can't stop here. We must continue to push policies that will tear down structural racism, reimagine public safety, and divest from policing so we can invest more in education, healthcare, mental health, jobs, transportation, things that keep us safe and our communities thriving.

Aiyana should be here. George should be here. Breonna Taylor should be here. They all should be here.

Thank you so much, Mr. Speaker, and I continue to work toward justice for all of us.

□ 0915

BUILD UPON THE ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF OUR FOREFATHERS

(Mr. WATKINS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. Speaker, leaders everywhere should decry the violent crowds toppling our statues. Our systems are the greatest ever devised by mankind. They deliver more equality, more justice, more liberty, and more pursuits of happiness than any other system throughout history.

Now, we haven't always lived up to the ideals of our system, but we should build upon the accomplishments of our forefathers, not destroy their memories. We must bring about change by following the laws, not breaking them. We must support our police, not ambush them.

WASHINGTON, D.C. ADMISSION ACT

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1017, I call up the bill (H.R. 51) to provide for the admission of the State of Washington, D.C. into the Union, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1017, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of the Rules Committee Print 116–55, modified by the amendment printed in part A of House Report 116–436, is adopted and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 51

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''Washington, D.C. Admission Act''.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents of this Act is as follows:

TITLE I—STATE OF WASHINGTON, D.C.

Subtitle A—Procedures for Admission

SEC. 101. ADMISSION INTO THE UNION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to the provisions of this Act, upon the issuance of the proclamation required by section 103(a), the State of Washington, Douglass Commonwealth is declared to be a State of the United States of America, and is declared admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the other States in all respects whatever.

(b) CONSTITUTION OF STATE.—The State Constitution shall always be republican in form and shall not be repugnant to the Constitution of the United States or the principles of the Declaration of Independence.

(c) NONSEVERABILITY.—If any provision of this section, or the application thereof to any person or circumstance, is held to be invalid, the remaining provisions of this Act and any amendments made by this Act shall be treated as invalid.

SEC. 102. ELECTION OF SENATORS AND REPRESENTATIVE.

(a) ISSUANCE OF PROCLAMATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not more than 30 days after receiving certification of the enactment of this Act from the President pursuant to section 403, the Mayor shall issue a proclamation for the first elections for 2 Senators and one Representative in Congress from the State, subject to the provisions of this section.

(2) SPECIAL RULE FOR ELECTIONS OF SENATORS.—In the elections of Senators from the State pursuant to paragraph (1), the 2 Senate offices shall be separately identified and designated, and no person may be a candidate for both offices. No such identification or designation of either of the offices shall refer to or be taken to refer to the terms of such offices, or in any way impair the privilege of the Senate to determine the class to which each of the Senators shall be assigned.

(b) RULES FOR CONDUCTING ELECTIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The proclamation of the Mayor issued under subsection (a) shall provide for the holding of a primary election and a general election, and at such elections the officers required to be elected as provided in subsection (a) shall be chosen by the qualified voters of the District of Columbia in the manner required by the laws of the District of Columbia.

(2) CERTIFICATION OF RESULTS.—Election results shall be certified in the manner required by the laws of the District of Columbia, except that the Mayor shall also provide written certification of the results of such elections to the President.

(c) ASSUMPTION OF DUTIES.—Upon the admission of the State into the Union, the Senators and Representative elected at the elections described in subsection (a) shall be entitled to be admitted to seats in Congress and to all the rights and privileges of Senators and Representatives of the other States in Congress.

(d) EFFECT OF ADMISSION ON HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES MEMBERSHIP.—

(1) PERMANENT INCREASE IN NUMBER OF MEMBERS.—Effective with respect to the Congress during which the State is admitted into the Union and each succeeding Congress, the House of Representatives shall be composed of 436 Members, including any Members representing the State.

(2) INITIAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIVES FOR STATE.—Until the taking effect of the first apportionment of Members occurring after the admission of the State into the Union, the State shall be entitled to one Representative in the House of Representatives upon its admission into the Union.

(3) APPORTIONMENT OF MEMBERS RESULTING FROM ADMISSION OF STATE.—

(A) APPORTIONMENT.—Section 22(a) of the Act entitled ''An Act to provide for the fifteenth and subsequent decennial censuses and to provide for apportionment of Representatives in Congress'', approved June 18, 1929 (2 U.S.C. 2a(a)), is amended by striking ''the then existing number of Representatives'' and inserting ''436 Representatives''.

(B) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subparagraph (A) shall apply with respect to the first regular decennial census conducted after the admission of the State into the Union and each subsequent regular decennial census.

SEC. 103. ISSUANCE OF PRESIDENTIAL PROCLAMATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The President, upon the certification of the results of the elections of the officers required to be elected as provided in section 102(a), shall, not later than 90 days after receiving such certification pursuant to section 102(b)(2), issue a proclamation announcing the results of such elections as so ascertained.

(b) ADMISSION OF STATE UPON ISSUANCE OF PROCLAMATION.—Upon the issuance of the proclamation by the President under subsection (a), the State shall be declared admitted into the Union as provided in section 101(a).

Subtitle B—Seat of Government of the United States

SEC. 111. TERRITORY AND BOUNDARIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsection (b), the State shall consist of all of the territory of the District of Columbia as of the date of the enactment of this Act, subject to the results of the metes and bounds survey conducted under subsection (c).

(b) EXCLUSION OF PORTION REMAINING AS SEAT OF GOVERNMENT OF UNITED STATES.—The territory of the State shall not include the area described in section 112, which shall be known as the ''Capital'' and shall serve as the seat of the Government of the United States, as provided in clause 17 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution of the United States.

(c) METES AND BOUNDS SURVEY.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President (in consultation with the Chair of the National Capital Planning Commission) shall conduct a metes and bounds survey of the Capital, as described in section 112(b).

SEC. 112. DESCRIPTION OF CAPITAL.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsection (c), upon the admission of the State into the Union, the Capital shall consist of the property described in subsection (b) and shall include the principal Federal monuments, the White House, the Capitol Building, the United States Supreme Court Building, and the Federal executive, legislative, and judicial office buildings located adjacent to the Mall and the Capitol Building (as such terms are used in section 8501(a) of title 40, United States Code).

(b) GENERAL DESCRIPTION.—Upon the admission of the State into the Union, the boundaries of the Capital shall be as follows: Beginning at the intersection of the southern right-of-way of F Street NE and the eastern right-of-way of 2nd Street NE;

(1) thence south along said eastern right-of-way of 2nd Street NE to its intersection with the northeastern right-of-way of Maryland Avenue NE;

(2) thence southwest along said northeastern right-of-way of Maryland Avenue NE to its intersection with the northern right-of-way of Constitution Avenue NE;

(3) thence west along said northern right-of-way of Constitution Avenue NE to its intersection with the eastern right-of-way of 1st Street NE;

(4) thence south along said eastern right-of-way of 1st Street NE to its intersection with the southeastern right-of-way of Maryland Avenue NE;

(5) thence northeast along said southeastern right-of-way of Maryland Avenue NE to its intersection with the eastern right-of-way of 2nd Street SE;

(6) thence south along said eastern right-of-way of 2nd Street SE to the eastern right-of-way of 2nd Street SE;

(7) thence south along said eastern right-of-way of 2nd Street SE to its intersection with the northern property boundary of the property designated as Square 760 Lot 803;

(8) thence east along said northern property boundary of Square 760 Lot 803 to its intersection with the western right-of-way of 3rd Street SE;

(9) thence south along said western right-of-way of 3rd Street SE to its intersection with the northern right-of-way of Independence Avenue SE;

(10) thence west along said northern right-of-way of Independence Avenue SE to its intersection with the northwestern right-of-way of Pennsylvania Avenue SE;

(11) thence northwest along said northwestern right-of-way of Pennsylvania Avenue SE to its intersection with the eastern right-of-way of 2nd Street SE;

(12) thence south along said eastern right-of-way of 2nd Street SE to its intersection with the southern right-of-way of C Street SE;

(13) thence west along said southern right-of-way of C Street SE to its intersection with the eastern right-of-way of 1st Street SE;

(14) thence south along said eastern right-of-way of 1st Street SE to its intersection with the southern right-of-way of D Street SE;

(15) thence west along said southern right-of-way of D Street SE to its intersection with the eastern right-of-way of South Capitol Street;

(16) thence south along said eastern right-of-way of South Capitol Street to its intersection with the northwestern right-of-way of Canal Street SE;

(17) thence southeast along said northwestern right-of-way of Canal Street SE to its intersection with the southern right-of-way of E Street SE;

(18) thence east along said southern right-of-way of said E Street SE to its intersection with the western right-of-way of 1st Street SE;

(19) thence south along said western right-of-way of 1st Street SE to its intersection with the southernmost corner of the property designated as Square 736S Lot 801;

(20) thence west along a line extended due west from said corner of said property designated as Square 736S Lot 801 to its intersection with the southwestern right-of-way of New Jersey Avenue SE;

(21) thence southeast along said southwestern right-of-way of New Jersey Avenue SE to its intersection with the northwestern right-of-way of Virginia Avenue SE;

(22) thence northwest along said northwestern right-of-way of Virginia Avenue SE to its intersection with the western right-of-way of South Capitol Street;

(23) thence north along said western right-of-way of South Capitol Street to its intersection with the southern right-of-way of E Street SW;

(24) thence west along said southern right-of-way of E Street SW to its end;

(25) thence west along a line extending said southern right-of-way of E Street SW westward to its intersection with the eastern right-of-way of 2nd Street SW;

(26) thence north along said eastern right-of-way of 2nd Street SW to its intersection with the southwestern right-of-way of Virginia Avenue SW;

(27) thence northwest along said southwestern right-of-way of Virginia Avenue SW to its intersection with the western right-of-way of 3rd Street SW;

(28) thence north along said western right-of-way of 3rd Street SW to its intersection with the northern right-of-way of D Street SW;

(29) thence west along said northern right-of-way of D Street SW to its intersection with the eastern right-of-way of 4th Street SW;

(30) thence north along said eastern right-of-way of 4th Street SW to its intersection with the northern right-of-way of C Street SW;

(31) thence west along said northern right-of-way of C Street SW to its intersection with the eastern right-of-way of 6th Street SW;

(32) thence north along said eastern right-of-way of 6th Street SW to its intersection with the northern right-of-way of Independence Avenue SW;

(33) thence west along said northern right-of-way of Independence Avenue SW to its intersection with the western right-of-way of 12th Street SW;

(34) thence south along said western right-of-way of 12th Street SW to its intersection with the northern right-of-way of D Street SW;

(35) thence west along said northern right-of-way of D Street SW to its intersection with the eastern right-of-way of 14th Street SW;

(36) thence south along said eastern right-of-way of 14th Street SW to its intersection with the northeastern boundary of the Consolidated Rail Corporation railroad easement;

(37) thence southwest along said northeastern boundary of the Consolidated Rail Corporation railroad easement to its intersection with the eastern shore of the Potomac River;

(38) thence generally northwest along said eastern shore of the Potomac River to its intersection with a line extending westward the northern boundary of the property designated as Square 12 Lot 806;

(39) thence east along said line extending westward the northern boundary of the property designated as Square 12 Lot 806 to the northern property boundary of the property designated as Square 12 Lot 806, and continuing east along said northern boundary of said property designated as Square 12 Lot 806 to its northeast corner;

(40) thence east along a line extending east from said northeast corner of the property designated as Square 12 Lot 806 to its intersection with the western boundary of the property designated as Square 33 Lot 87;

(41) thence south along said western boundary of the property designated as Square 33 Lot 87 to its intersection with the northwest corner of the property designated as Square 33 Lot 88;

(42) thence counter-clockwise around the boundary of said property designated as Square 33 Lot 88 to its southeast corner, which is along the northern right-of-way of E Street NW;

(43) thence east along said northern right-of-way of E Street NW to its intersection with the western right-of-way of 18th Street NW;

(44) thence south along said western right-of-way of 18th Street NW to its intersection with the southwestern right-of-way of Virginia Avenue NW;

(45) thence southeast along said southwestern right-of-way of Virginia Avenue NW to its intersection with the northern right-of-way of Constitution Avenue NW;

(46) thence east along said northern right-of-way of Constitution Avenue NW to its intersection with the eastern right-of-way of 17th Street NW;

(47) thence north along said eastern right-of-way of 17th Street NW to its intersection with the southern right-of-way of H Street NW;

(48) thence east along said southern right-of-way of H Street NW to its intersection with the northwest corner of the property designated as Square 221 Lot 35;

(49) thence counter-clockwise around the boundary of said property designated as Square 221 Lot 35 to its southeast corner, which is along the boundary of the property designated as Square 221 Lot 37;

(50) thence counter-clockwise around the boundary of said property designated as Square 221 Lot 37 to its southwest corner, which it shares with the property designated as Square 221 Lot 818;

(51) thence south along the boundary of said property designated as Square 221 Lot 818 to its southwest corner, which it shares with the property designated as Square 221 Lot 40;

(52) thence south along the boundary of said property designated as Square 221 Lot 40 to its southwest corner;

(53) thence east along the southern border of said property designated as Square 221 Lot 40 to its intersection with the northwest corner of the property designated as Square 221 Lot 820;

(54) thence south along the western boundary of said property designated as Square 221 Lot 820 to its southwest corner, which it shares with the property designated as Square 221 Lot 39;

(55) thence south along the western boundary of said property designated as Square 221 Lot 39 to its southwest corner, which is along the northern right-of-way of Pennsylvania Avenue NW;

(56) thence east along said northern right-of-way of Pennsylvania Avenue NW to its intersection with the western right-of-way of 15th Street NW;

(57) thence south along said western right-of-way of 15th Street NW to its intersection with a line extending northwest from the southern right-of-way of the portion of Pennsylvania Avenue NW north of Pershing Square;

(58) thence southeast along said line extending the southern right-of-way of Pennsylvania Avenue NW to the southern right-of-way of Pennsylvania Avenue NW, and continuing southeast along said southern right-of-way of Pennsylvania Avenue NW to its intersection with the western right-of-way of 14th Street NW;

(59) thence south along said western right-of-way of 14th Street NW to its intersection with a line extending west from the southern right-of-way of D Street NW;

(60) thence east along said line extending west from the southern right-of-way of D Street NW to the southern right-of-way of D Street NW, and continuing east along said southern right-of-way of D Street NW to its intersection with the eastern right-of-way of 13½ Street NW;

(61) thence north along said eastern right-of-way of 13½ Street NW to its intersection with the southern right-of-way of Pennsylvania Avenue NW;

(62) thence east and southeast along said southern right-of-way of Pennsylvania Avenue NW to its intersection with the western right-of-way of 12th Street NW;

(63) thence south along said western right-of-way of 12th Street NW to its intersection with a line extending to the west the southern boundary of the property designated as Square 324 Lot 809;

(64) thence east along said line to the southwest corner of said property designated as Square 324 Lot 809, and continuing northeast along the southern boundary of said property designated as Square 324 Lot 809 to its eastern corner, which it shares with the property designated as Square 323 Lot 802;

(65) thence east along the southern boundary of said property designated as Square 323 Lot 802 to its southeast corner, which it shares with the property designated as Square 324 Lot 808;

(66) thence counter-clockwise around the boundary of said property designated as Square 324 Lot 808 to its northeastern corner, which is along the southern right-of-way of Pennsylvania Avenue NW;

(67) thence southeast along said southern right-of-way of Pennsylvania Avenue NW to its intersection with the eastern right-of-way of 4th Street NW;

(68) thence north along a line extending north from said eastern right-of-way of 4th Street NW to its intersection with the southern right-of-way of C Street NW;

(69) thence east along said southern right-of-way of C Street NW to its intersection with the eastern right-of-way of 3rd Street NW;

(70) thence north along said eastern right-of-way of 3rd Street NW to its intersection with the southern right-of-way of D Street NW;

(71) thence east along said southern right-of-way of D Street NW to its intersection with the western right-of-way of 1st Street NW;

(72) thence south along said western right-of-way of 1st Street NW to its intersection with the northern right-of-way of C Street NW;

(73) thence west along said northern right-of-way of C Street NW to its intersection with the western right-of-way of 2nd Street NW;

(74) thence south along said western right-of-way of 2nd Street NW to its intersection with the northern right-of-way of Constitution Avenue NW;

(75) thence east along said northern right-of-way of Constitution Avenue NW to its intersection with the northeastern right-of-way of Louisiana Avenue NW;

(76) thence northeast along said northeastern right-of-way of Louisiana Avenue NW to its intersection with the southwestern right-of-way of New Jersey Avenue NW;

(77) thence northwest along said southwestern right-of-way of New Jersey Avenue NW to its intersection with the northern right-of-way of D Street NW;

(78) thence east along said northern right-of-way of D Street NW to its intersection with the northeastern right-of-way of Louisiana Avenue NW;

(79) thence northeast along said northwestern right-of-way of Louisiana Avenue NW to its intersection with the western right-of-way of North Capitol Street;

(80) thence north along said western right-of-way of North Capitol Street to its intersection with the southwestern right-of-way of Massachusetts Avenue NW;

(81) thence southeast along said southwestern right-of-way of Massachusetts Avenue NW to the southwestern right-of-way of Massachusetts Avenue NE;

(82) thence southeast along said southwestern right-of-way of Massachusetts Avenue NE to the southern right-of-way of Columbus Circle NE;

(83) thence counter-clockwise along said southern right-of-way of Columbus Circle NE to its intersection with the southern right-of way of F Street NE; and

(84) thence east along said southern right-of-way of F Street NE to the point of beginning.

(c) EXCLUSION OF BUILDING SERVING AS STATE CAPITOL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, after the admission of the State into the Union, the Capital shall not be considered to include the building known as the ''John A. Wilson Building'', as described and designated under section 601(a) of the Omnibus Spending Reduction Act of 1993 (sec. 10–1301(a), D.C. Official Code).

(d) CLARIFICATION OF TREATMENT OF FRANCES PERKINS BUILDING.—The entirety of the Frances Perkins Building, including any portion of the Building which is north of D Street Northwest, shall be included in the Capital.

SEC. 113. RETENTION OF TITLE TO PROPERTY.

(a) RETENTION OF FEDERAL TITLE.—The United States shall have and retain title to, or jurisdiction over, for purposes of administration and maintenance, all real and personal property with respect to which the United States holds title or jurisdiction for such purposes on the day before the date of the admission of the State into the Union.

(b) RETENTION OF STATE TITLE.—The State shall have and retain title to, or jurisdiction over, for purposes of administration and maintenance, all real and personal property with respect to which the District of Columbia holds title or jurisdiction for such purposes on the day before the date of the admission of the State into the Union.

SEC. 114. EFFECT OF ADMISSION ON CURRENT LAWS OF SEAT OF GOVERNMENT OF UNITED STATES.

Except as otherwise provided in this Act, the laws of the District of Columbia which are in effect on the day before the date of the admission of the State into the Union (without regard to whether such laws were enacted by Congress or by the District of Columbia) shall apply in the Capital in the same manner and to the same extent beginning on the date of the admission of the State into the Union, and shall be deemed laws of the United States which are applicable only in or to the Capital.

SEC. 115. CAPITAL NATIONAL GUARD.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—Title 32, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) DEFINITIONS.—In paragraphs (4), (6), and (19) of section 101, by striking ''District of Columbia'' each place it appears and inserting ''Capital''.

(2) BRANCHES AND ORGANIZATIONS.—In section 103, by striking ''District of Columbia'' and inserting ''Capital''.

(3) UNITS: LOCATION; ORGANIZATION; COMMAND.—In subsections (c) and (d) of section 104, by striking ''District of Columbia'' both places it appears and inserting ''Capital''.

(4) AVAILABILITY OF APPROPRIATIONS.—In section 107(b), by striking ''District of Columbia'' and inserting ''Capital''.

(5) MAINTENANCE OF OTHER TROOPS.—In subsections (a), (b), and (c) of section 109, by striking ''District of Columbia'' each place it appears and inserting ''Capital''.

(6) DRUG INTERDICTION AND COUNTER-DRUG ACTIVITIES.—In section 112(h)—

(A) by striking ''District of Columbia,'' both places it appears and inserting ''Capital,''; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking ''National Guard of the District of Columbia'' and inserting ''Capital National Guard''.

(7) ENLISTMENT OATH.—In section 304, by striking ''District of Columbia'' and inserting ''Capital''.

(8) ADJUTANTS GENERAL.—In section 314, by striking ''District of Columbia'' each place it appears and inserting ''Capital''.

(9) DETAIL OF REGULAR MEMBERS OF ARMY AND AIR FORCE TO DUTY WITH NATIONAL GUARD.—In section 315, by striking ''District of Columbia'' each place it appears and inserting ''Capital''.

(10) DISCHARGE OF OFFICERS; TERMINATION OF APPOINTMENT.—In section 324(b), by striking ''District of Columbia'' and inserting ''Capital''.

(11) RELIEF FROM NATIONAL GUARD DUTY WHEN ORDERED TO ACTIVE DUTY.—In subsections (a) and (b) of section 325, by striking ''District of Columbia'' each place it appears and inserting ''Capital''.

(12) COURTS-MARTIAL OF NATIONAL GUARD NOT IN FEDERAL SERVICE: COMPOSITION, JURISDICTION, AND PROCEDURES; CONVENING AUTHORITY.—In sections 326 and 327, by striking ''District of Columbia'' each place it appears and inserting ''Capital''.

(13) ACTIVE GUARD AND RESERVE DUTY: GOVERNOR'S AUTHORITY.—In section 328(a), by striking ''District of Columbia'' and inserting ''Capital''.

(14) TRAINING GENERALLY.—In section 501(b), by striking ''District of Columbia'' and inserting ''Capital''.

(15) PARTICIPATION IN FIELD EXERCISES.—In section 503(b), by striking ''District of Columbia'' and inserting ''Capital''.

(16) NATIONAL GUARD SCHOOLS AND SMALL ARMS COMPETITIONS.—In section 504(b), by striking ''District of Columbia'' and inserting ''Capital''.

(17) ARMY AND AIR FORCE SCHOOLS AND FIELD EXERCISES.—In section 505, by striking ''National Guard of the District of Columbia'' and inserting ''Capital National Guard''.

(18) NATIONAL GUARD YOUTH CHALLENGE PROGRAM.—In subsections (c)(1), (g)(2), (j), (k), and (l)(1) of section 509, by striking ''District of Columbia'' each place it appears and inserting ''Capital''.

(19) ISSUE OF SUPPLIES.—In section 702—

(A) in subsection (a), by striking ''National Guard of the District of Columbia'' and inserting ''Capital National Guard''; and

(B) in subsections (b), (c), and (d), by striking ''District of Columbia'' each place it appears and inserting ''Capital''.

(20) PURCHASES OF SUPPLIES FROM ARMY OR AIR FORCE.—In subsections (a) and (b) of section 703, by striking ''District of Columbia'' both places it appears and inserting ''Capital''.

(21) ACCOUNTABILITY: RELIEF FROM UPON ORDER TO ACTIVE DUTY.—In section 704, by striking ''District of Columbia'' and inserting ''Capital''.

(22) PROPERTY AND FISCAL OFFICERS.—In section 708—

(A) in subsection (a), by striking ''National Guard of the District of Columbia'' and inserting ''Capital National Guard''; and

(B) in subsection (d), by striking ''District of Columbia'' and inserting ''Capital''.

(23) ACCOUNTABILITY FOR PROPERTY ISSUED TO THE NATIONAL GUARD.—In subsections (c), (d), (e), and (f) of section 710, by striking ''District of Columbia'' each place it appears and inserting ''Capital''.

(24) DISPOSITION OF OBSOLETE OR CONDEMNED PROPERTY.—In section 711, by striking ''District of Columbia'' and inserting ''Capital''.

(25) DISPOSITION OF PROCEEDS OF CONDEMNED STORES ISSUED TO NATIONAL GUARD.—In paragraph (1) of section 712, by striking ''District of Columbia'' and inserting ''Capital''.

(26) PROPERTY LOSS; PERSONAL INJURY OR DEATH.—In section 715(c), by striking ''District of Columbia'' and inserting ''Capital''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) CAPITAL DEFINED.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Section 101 of title 32, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(20) 'Capital' means the area serving as the seat of the Government of the United States, as described in section 112 of the Washington, D.C. Admission Act.''.

(B) WITH REGARDS TO HOMELAND DEFENSE ACTIVITIES.—Section 901 of title 32, United States Code, is amended—

(i) in paragraph (2), by striking ''District of Columbia'' and inserting ''Capital''; and

(ii) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(3) The term 'Governor' means, with respect to the Capital, the commanding general of the Capital National Guard.''.

(2) TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE.—Title 10, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(A) DEFINITIONS.—In section 101—

(i) in subsection (a), by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(19) The term 'Capital' means the area serving as the seat of the Government of the United States, as described in section 112 of the Washington, D.C. Admission Act.'';

(ii) in paragraphs (2) and (4) of subsection (c), by striking ''District of Columbia'' both places it appears and inserting ''Capital''; and

(iii) in subsection (d)(5), by striking ''District of Columbia'' and inserting ''Capital''.

(B) DISPOSITION ON DISCHARGE.—In section 771a(c), by striking ''District of Columbia'' and inserting ''Capital''.

(C) TRICARE COVERAGE FOR CERTAIN MEMBERS OF THE NATIONAL GUARD AND DEPENDENTS DURING CERTAIN DISASTER RESPONSE DUTY.—In section 1076f—

(i) in subsections (a) and (c)(1), by striking ''with respect to the District of Columbia, the mayor of the District of Columbia'' both places it appears and inserting ''with respect to the Capital, the commanding general of the Capital National Guard''; and

(ii) in subsection (c)(2), by striking ''District of Columbia'' and inserting ''Capital''.

(D) PAYMENT OF CLAIMS: AVAILABILITY OF APPROPRIATIONS.—In paragraph (2)(B) of section 2732, by striking ''District of Columbia'' and inserting ''Capital''.

(E) MEMBERS OF ARMY NATIONAL GUARD: DETAIL AS STUDENTS, OBSERVERS, AND INVESTIGATORS AT EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS, INDUSTRIAL PLANTS, AND HOSPITALS.—In section 7401(c), by striking ''District of Columbia'' and inserting ''Capital''.

(F) MEMBERS OF AIR NATIONAL GUARD: DETAIL AS STUDENTS, OBSERVERS, AND INVESTIGATORS AT EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS, INDUSTRIAL PLANTS, AND HOSPITALS.—In section 9401(c), by striking ''District of Columbia'' and inserting ''Capital''.

(G) READY RESERVE: FAILURE TO SATISFACTORILY PERFORM PRESCRIBED TRAINING.—In section 10148(b)—

(i) by striking ''District of Columbia,'' and inserting ''Capital,''; and

(ii) by striking ''District of Columbia National Guard'' and inserting ''Capital National Guard''.

(H) CHIEF OF THE NATIONAL GUARD BUREAU.—In section 10502(a)(1)—

(i) by striking ''District of Columbia,'' and inserting ''Capital,''; and

(ii) by striking ''District of Columbia National Guard'' and inserting ''Capital National Guard''.

(I) VICE CHIEF OF THE NATIONAL GUARD BUREAU.—In section 10505(a)(1)(A)—

(i) by striking ''District of Columbia,'' and inserting ''Capital,''; and

(ii) by striking ''District of Columbia National Guard'' and inserting ''Capital National Guard''.

(J) OTHER SENIOR NATIONAL GUARD BUREAU OFFICERS.—In subparagraphs (A) and (B) of section 10506(a)(1)—

(i) by striking ''District of Columbia,'' both places it appears and inserting ''Capital,''; and

(ii) by striking ''District of Columbia National Guard'' both places it appears and inserting ''Capital National Guard''.

(K) NATIONAL GUARD BUREAU: GENERAL PROVISIONS.—In section 10508(b)(1), by striking ''District of Columbia'' and inserting ''Capital''.

(L) COMMISSIONED OFFICERS: ORIGINAL APPOINTMENT; LIMITATION.—In section 12204(b), by striking ''District of Columbia'' and inserting ''Capital''.

(M) RESERVE COMPONENTS GENERALLY.—In section 12301(b), by striking ''District of Columbia National Guard'' both places it appears and inserting ''Capital National Guard''.

(N) NATIONAL GUARD IN FEDERAL SERVICE: CALL.—In section 12406—

(i) by striking ''District of Columbia,'' and inserting ''Capital,''; and

(ii) by striking ''National Guard of the District of Columbia'' and inserting ''Capital National Guard''.

(O) RESULT OF FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH STANDARDS AND QUALIFICATIONS.—In section 12642(c), by striking ''District of Columbia'' and inserting ''Capital''.

(P) LIMITATION ON RELOCATION OF NATIONAL GUARD UNITS.—In section 18238—

(i) by striking ''District of Columbia,'' and inserting ''Capital,''; and

(ii) by striking ''National Guard of the District of Columbia'' and inserting ''Capital National Guard''.

SEC. 116. TERMINATION OF LEGAL STATUS OF SEAT OF GOVERNMENT OF UNITED STATES AS MUNICIPAL CORPORATION.

Notwithstanding section 2 of the Revised Statutes relating to the District of Columbia (sec. 1–102, D.C. Official Code) or any other provision of law codified in subchapter I of chapter 1 of the District of Columbia Official Code, effective upon the date of the admission of the State into the Union, the Capital (or any portion thereof) shall not serve as a government and shall not be a body corporate for municipal purposes.

Subtitle C—General Provisions Relating to Laws of State

SEC. 121. EFFECT OF ADMISSION ON CURRENT LAWS.

(a) LEGISLATIVE POWER.—The legislative power of the State shall extend to all rightful subjects of legislation in the State, consistent with the Constitution of the United States (including the restrictions and limitations imposed upon the States by article I, section 10) and subject to the provisions of this Act.

(b) CONTINUATION OF AUTHORITY AND DUTIES OF MEMBERS OF EXECUTIVE, LEGISLATIVE, AND JUDICIAL OFFICES.—Upon the admission of the State into the Union, members of executive, legislative, and judicial offices of the District of Columbia shall be deemed members of the respective executive, legislative, and judicial offices of the State, as provided by the State Constitution and the laws of the State.

(c) TREATMENT OF FEDERAL LAWS.—To the extent that any law of the United States applies to the States generally, the law shall have the same force and effect in the State as elsewhere in the United States, except as such law may otherwise provide.

(d) NO EFFECT ON EXISTING CONTRACTS.—Nothing in the admission of the State into the Union shall affect any obligation under any contract or agreement under which the District of Columbia or the United States is a party, as in effect on the day before the date of the admission of the State into the Union.

(e) SUCCESSION IN INTERSTATE COMPACTS.—The State shall be deemed to be the successor to the District of Columbia for purposes of any interstate compact which is in effect on the day before the date of the admission of the State into the Union.

(f) CONTINUATION OF SERVICE OF FEDERAL MEMBERS ON BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS.—Nothing in the admission of the State into the Union shall affect the authority of a representative of the Federal Government who, as of the day before the date of the admission of the State into the Union, is a member of a board or commission of the District of Columbia to serve as a member of such board or commission or as a member of a successor to such board or commission after the admission of the State into the Union, as may be provided by the State Constitution and the laws of the State.

(g) SPECIAL RULE REGARDING ENFORCEMENT AUTHORITY OF UNITED STATES CAPITOL POLICE, UNITED STATES PARK POLICE, AND UNITED STATES SECRET SERVICE UNIFORMED DIVISION.—The United States Capitol Police, the United States Park Police, and the United States Secret Service Uniformed Division may not enforce any law of the State in the State, except to the extent authorized by the State. Nothing in this subsection may be construed to affect the authority of the United States Capitol Police, the United States Park Police, and the United States Secret Service Uniformed Division to enforce any law in the Capital.

SEC. 122. PENDING ACTIONS AND PROCEEDINGS.

(a) STATE AS LEGAL SUCCESSOR TO DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.—The State shall be the legal successor to the District of Columbia in all matters.

(b) NO EFFECT ON PENDING PROCEEDINGS.—All existing writs, actions, suits, judicial and administrative proceedings, civil or criminal liabilities, prosecutions, judgments, sentences, orders, decrees, appeals, causes of action, claims, demands, titles, and rights shall continue unaffected by the admission of the State into the Union with respect to the State or the United States, except as may be provided under this Act, as may be modified in accordance with the provisions of the State Constitution, and as may be modified by the laws of the State or the United States, as the case may be.

SEC. 123. LIMITATION ON AUTHORITY TO TAX FEDERAL PROPERTY.

The State may not impose any tax on any real or personal property owned or acquired by the United States, except to the extent that Congress may permit.

SEC. 124. UNITED STATES NATIONALITY.

No provision of this Act shall operate to confer United States nationality, to terminate nationality lawfully acquired, or to restore nationality terminated or lost under any law of the United States or under any treaty to which the United States is or was a party.

TITLE II—INTERESTS OF FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Subtitle A—Federal Property

SEC. 201. TREATMENT OF MILITARY LANDS.

(a) RESERVATION OF FEDERAL AUTHORITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2) and subsection (b) and notwithstanding the admission of the State into the Union, authority is reserved in the United States for the exercise by Congress of the power of exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever over such tracts or parcels of land located in the State that, on the day before the date of the admission of the State into the Union, are controlled or owned by the United States and held for defense or Coast Guard purposes.

(2) LIMITATION ON AUTHORITY.—The power of exclusive legislation described in paragraph (1) shall vest and remain in the United States only so long as the particular tract or parcel of land involved is controlled or owned by the United States and held for defense or Coast Guard purposes.

(b) AUTHORITY OF STATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The reservation of authority in the United States under subsection (a) shall not operate to prevent such tracts or parcels of land from being a part of the State, or to prevent the State from exercising over or upon such lands, concurrently with the United States, any jurisdiction which it would have in the absence of such reservation of authority and which is consistent with the laws hereafter enacted by Congress pursuant to such reservation of authority.

(2) SERVICE OF PROCESS.—The State shall have the right to serve civil or criminal process in such tracts or parcels of land in which the authority of the United States is reserved under subsection (a) in suits or prosecutions for or on account of rights acquired, obligations incurred, or crimes committed in the State but outside of such lands.

SEC. 202. WAIVER OF CLAIMS TO FEDERAL PROPERTY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—As a compact with the United States, the State and its people disclaim all right and title to any real or personal property not granted or confirmed to the State by or under the authority of this Act, the right or title to which is held by the United States or subject to disposition by the United States.

(b) EFFECT ON CLAIMS AGAINST UNITED STATES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Nothing in this Act shall recognize, deny, enlarge, impair, or otherwise affect any claim against the United States, and any such claim shall be governed by applicable laws of the United States.

(2) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this Act is intended or shall be construed as a finding, interpretation, or construction by Congress that any applicable law authorizes, establishes, recognizes, or confirms the validity or invalidity of any claim referred to in paragraph (1), and the determination of the applicability to or the effect of any law on any such claim shall be unaffected by anything in this Act.

Subtitle B—Federal Courts

SEC. 211. RESIDENCY REQUIREMENTS FOR CERTAIN FEDERAL OFFICIALS.

(a) CIRCUIT JUDGES.—Section 44(c) of title 28, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking ''Except in the District of Columbia, each'' and inserting ''Each''; and

(2) by striking ''within fifty miles of the District of Columbia'' and inserting ''within fifty miles of the Capital''.

(b) DISTRICT JUDGES.—Section 134(b) of such title is amended in the first sentence by striking ''the District of Columbia, the Southern District of New York, and'' and inserting ''the Southern District of New York and''.

(c) UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS.—Section 545(a) of such title is amended by striking the first sentence and inserting ''Each United States attorney shall reside in the district for which he or she is appointed, except that those officers of the Southern District of New York and the Eastern District of New York may reside within 20 miles thereof.''.

(d) UNITED STATES MARSHALS.—Section 561(e)(1) of such title is amended to read as follows:

''(1) the marshal for the Southern District of New York may reside within 20 miles of the district; and''.

(e) CLERKS OF DISTRICT COURTS.—Section 751(c) of such title is amended by striking ''the District of Columbia and''.

(f) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply only to individuals appointed after the date of the admission of the State into the Union.

SEC. 212. RENAMING OF FEDERAL COURTS.

(a) RENAMING.—

(1) CIRCUIT COURT.—Section 41 of title 28, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in the first column, by striking ''District of Columbia'' and inserting ''Capital''; and

(B) in the second column, by striking ''District of Columbia'' and inserting ''Capital; Washington, Douglass Commonwealth''.

(2) DISTRICT COURT.—Section 88 of such title is amended—

(A) in the heading, by striking ''***District of Columbia***'' and inserting ''***Washington, Douglass Commonwealth and the Capital***'';

(B) by amending the first paragraph to read as follows:

''The State of Washington, Douglass Commonwealth and the Capital comprise one judicial district.''; and

(C) in the second paragraph, by striking ''Washington'' and inserting ''the Capital''.

(3) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The item relating to section 88 in the table of sections for chapter 5 of such title is amended to read as follows:

''88. Washington, Douglass Commonwealth and the Capital.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS RELATING TO COURT OF APPEALS.—Title 28, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) APPOINTMENT OF JUDGES.—Section 44(a) of such title is amended in the first column by striking ''District of Columbia'' and inserting ''Capital''.

(2) TERMS OF COURT.—Section 48(a) of such title is amended—

(A) in the first column, by striking ''District of Columbia'' and inserting ''Capital'';

(B) in the second column, by striking ''Washington'' and inserting ''Capital'' ; and

(C) in the second column, by striking ''District of Columbia'' and inserting ''Capital''.

(3) APPOINTMENT OF INDEPENDENT COUNSELS BY CHIEF JUDGE OF CIRCUIT.—Section 49 of such title is amended by striking ''District of Columbia'' each place it appears and inserting ''Capital''.

(4) CIRCUIT COURT JURISDICTION OVER CERTIFICATION OF DEATH PENALTY COUNSELS.—Section 2265(c)(2) of such title is amended by striking ''the District of Columbia Circuit'' and inserting ''the Capital Circuit''.

(5) CIRCUIT COURT JURISDICTION OVER REVIEW OF FEDERAL AGENCY ORDERS.—Section 2343 of such title is amended by striking ''the District of Columbia Circuit'' and inserting ''the Capital Circuit''.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS RELATING TO DISTRICT COURT.—Title 28, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) APPOINTMENT AND NUMBER OF DISTRICT COURT JUDGES.—Section 133(a) of such title is amended in the first column by striking ''District of Columbia'' and inserting ''Washington, Douglass Commonwealth and the Capital''.

(2) DISTRICT COURT JURISDICTION OF TAX CASES BROUGHT AGAINST UNITED STATES.—Section 1346(e) of such title is amended by striking ''the District of Columbia'' and inserting ''Washington, Douglass Commonwealth and the Capital''.

(3) DISTRICT COURT JURISDICTION OVER PROCEEDINGS FOR FORFEITURE OF FOREIGN PROPERTY.—Section 1355(b)(2) of such title is amended by striking ''the District of Columbia'' and inserting ''Washington, Douglass Commonwealth and the Capital''.

(4) DISTRICT COURT JURISDICTION OVER CIVIL ACTIONS BROUGHT AGAINST A FOREIGN STATE.—Section 1391(f)(4) of such title is amended by striking ''the District of Columbia'' and inserting ''Washington, Douglass Commonwealth and the Capital''.

(5) DISTRICT COURT JURISDICTION OVER ACTIONS BROUGHT BY CORPORATIONS AGAINST UNITED STATES.—Section 1402(a)(2) of such title is amended by striking ''the District of Columbia'' and inserting ''Washington, Douglass Commonwealth and the Capital''.

(6) VENUE IN DISTRICT COURT OF CERTAIN ACTIONS BROUGHT BY EMPLOYEES OF EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT.—Section 1413 of such title is amended by striking ''the District of Columbia'' and inserting ''Washington, Douglass Commonwealth and the Capital''.

(7) VENUE IN DISTRICT COURT OF ACTION ENFORCING FOREIGN JUDGMENT.—Section 2467(c)(2)(B) of such title is amended by striking ''the District of Columbia'' and inserting ''Washington, Douglass Commonwealth and the Capital''.

(d) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS RELATING TO OTHER COURTS.—Title 28, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) APPOINTMENT OF BANKRUPTCY JUDGES.—Section 152(a)(2) of such title is amended in the first column by striking ''District of Columbia'' and inserting ''Washington, Douglass Commonwealth and the Capital''.

(2) LOCATION OF COURT OF FEDERAL CLAIMS.—Section 173 of such title is amended by striking ''the District of Columbia'' and inserting ''the Capital''.

(3) DUTY STATION OF JUDGES OF COURT OF FEDERAL CLAIMS.—Section 175 of such title is amended by striking ''the District of Columbia'' each place it appears and inserting ''the Capital''.

(4) DUTY STATION OF JUDGES FOR PURPOSES OF TRAVELING EXPENSES.—Section 456(b) of such title is amended to read as follows:

''(b) The official duty station of the Chief Justice of the United States, the Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States, and the judges of the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit shall be the Capital.''.

(5) COURT ACCOMMODATIONS FOR FEDERAL CIRCUIT AND COURT OF FEDERAL CLAIMS.—Section 462(d) of such title is amended by striking ''the District of Columbia'' and inserting ''the Capital''.

(6) PLACES OF HOLDING COURT OF COURT OF FEDERAL CLAIMS.—Section 798(a) of such title is amended—

(A) by striking ''Washington, District of Columbia'' and inserting ''the Capital''; and

(B) by striking ''the District of Columbia'' and inserting ''the Capital''.

(e) OTHER CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) SERVICE OF PROCESS ON FOREIGN PARTIES AT STATE DEPARTMENT OFFICE.—Section 1608(a)(4) of such title is amended by striking ''Washington, District of Columbia'' and inserting ''the Capital''.

(2) SERVICE OF PROCESS IN PROPERTY CASES AT ATTORNEY GENERAL OFFICE.—Section 2410(b) of such title is amended by striking ''Washington, District of Columbia'' and inserting ''the Capital''.

(f) DEFINITION.—Section 451 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new undesignated paragraph:

''The term 'Capital' means the area serving as the seat of the Government of the United States, as described in section 112 of the Washington, D.C. Admission Act.''.

(g) REFERENCES IN OTHER LAWS.—Any reference in any Federal law (other than a law amended by this section), rule, or regulation—

(1) to the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia shall be deemed to refer to the United States Court of Appeals for the Capital;

(2) to the District of Columbia Circuit shall be deemed to refer to the Capital Circuit; and

(3) to the United States District Court for the District of Columbia shall be deemed to refer to the United States District Court for Washington, Douglass Commonwealth and the Capital.

(h) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section and the amendments made by this section shall take effect upon the admission of the State into the Union.

SEC. 213. CONFORMING AMENDMENTS RELATING TO DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE.

(a) APPOINTMENT OF UNITED STATES TRUSTEES.—Section 581(a)(4) of title 28, United States Code, is amended by striking ''the District of Columbia'' and inserting ''the Capital and Washington, Douglass Commonwealth''.

(b) INDEPENDENT COUNSELS.—

(1) APPOINTMENT OF ADDITIONAL PERSONNEL.—Section 594(c) of such title is amended—

(A) by striking ''the District of Columbia'' the first place it appears and inserting ''Washington, Douglass Commonwealth and the Capital''; and

(B) by striking ''the District of Columbia'' the second place it appears and inserting ''Washington, Douglass Commonwealth''.

(2) JUDICIAL REVIEW OF REMOVAL.—Section 596(a)(3) of such title is amended by striking ''the District of Columbia'' and inserting ''Washington, Douglass Commonwealth and the Capital''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect upon the admission of the State into the Union.

SEC. 214. TREATMENT OF PRETRIAL SERVICES IN UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT.

Section 3152 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking ''(other than the District of Columbia)'' and inserting ''(subject to subsection (d), other than the District of Columbia)''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(d) In the case of the judicial district of Washington, Douglass Commonwealth and the Capital—

''(1) upon the admission of the State of Washington, Douglass Commonwealth into the Union, the Washington, Douglass Commonwealth Pretrial Services Agency shall continue to provide pretrial services in the judicial district in the same manner and to the same extent as the District of Columbia Pretrial Services Agency provided such services in the judicial district of the District of Columbia as of the day before the date of the admission of the State into the Union; and

''(2) upon the receipt by the President of the certification from the State of Washington, Douglass Commonwealth under section 315(b)(4) of the Washington, D.C. Admission Act that the State has in effect laws providing for the State to provide pre-trial services, paragraph (1) shall no longer apply, and the Director shall provide for the establishment of pretrial services in the judicial district under this section.''.

Subtitle C—Federal Elections

SEC. 221. PERMITTING INDIVIDUALS RESIDING IN CAPITAL TO VOTE IN FEDERAL ELECTIONS IN STATE OF MOST RECENT DOMICILE.

(a) REQUIREMENT FOR STATES TO PERMIT INDIVIDUALS TO VOTE BY ABSENTEE BALLOT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Each State shall—

(A) permit absent Capital voters to use absentee registration procedures and to vote by absentee ballot in general, special, primary, and runoff elections for Federal office; and

(B) accept and process, with respect to any general, special, primary, or runoff election for Federal office, any otherwise valid voter registration application from an absent Capital voter, if the application is received by the appropriate State election official not less than 30 days before the election.

(2) ABSENT CAPITAL VOTER DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''absent Capital voter'' means, with respect to a State, a person who resides in the Capital and is qualified to vote in the State (or who would be qualified to vote in the State but for residing in the Capital), but only if the State is the last place in which the person was domiciled before residing in the Capital.

(3) STATE DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''State'' means each of the several States, including the State.

(b) RECOMMENDATIONS TO STATES TO MAXIMIZE ACCESS TO POLLS BY ABSENT CAPITAL VOTERS.—To afford maximum access to the polls by absent Capital voters, it is the sense of Congress that the States should—

(1) waive registration requirements for absent Capital voters who, by reason of residence in the Capital, do not have an opportunity to register;

(2) expedite processing of balloting materials with respect to such individuals; and

(3) assure that absentee ballots are mailed to such individuals at the earliest opportunity.

(c) ENFORCEMENT.—The Attorney General may bring a civil action in the appropriate district court of the United States for such declaratory or injunctive relief as may be necessary to carry out this section.

(d) EFFECT ON CERTAIN OTHER LAWS.—The exercise of any right under this section shall not affect, for purposes of a Federal tax, a State tax, or a local tax, the residence or domicile of a person exercising such right.

(e) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section shall take effect upon the date of the admission of the State into the Union, and shall apply with respect to elections for Federal office taking place on or after such date.

SEC. 222. REPEAL OF OFFICE OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA DELEGATE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Sections 202 and 204 of the District of Columbia Delegate Act (Public Law 91–405; sections 1–401 and 1–402, D.C. Official Code) are repealed, and the provisions of law amended or repealed by such sections are restored or revived as if such sections had not been enacted.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS TO DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA ELECTIONS CODE OF 1955.—The District of Columbia Elections Code of 1955 is amended—

(1) in section 1 (sec. 1–1001.01, D.C. Official Code), by striking ''the Delegate to the House of Representatives,'';

(2) in section 2 (sec. 1–1001.02, D.C. Official Code)—

(A) by striking paragraph (6),

(B) in paragraph (12), by striking ''(except the Delegate to Congress for the District of Columbia)'', and

(C) in paragraph (13), by striking ''the Delegate to Congress for the District of Columbia,'';

(3) in section 8 (sec. 1–1001.08, D.C. Official Code)—

(A) by striking ''Delegate,'' in the heading, and

(B) by striking ''Delegate,'' each place it appears in subsections (d), (h)(1)(A), (h)(2), (i)(1), (j)(1), (j)(3), and (k)(3);

(4) in section 10 (sec. 1–1001.10, D.C. Official Code)—

(A) by striking subparagraph (A) of subsection (a)(3), and

(B) in subsection (d)—

(i) by striking ''Delegate,'' each place it appears in paragraph (1), and

(ii) by striking paragraph (2) and redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (2);

(5) in section 11(a)(2) (sec. 1–1001.11(a)(2), D.C. Official Code), by striking ''Delegate to the House of Representatives,'';

(6) in section 15(b) (sec. 1–1001.15(b), D.C. Official Code), by striking ''Delegate,''; and

(7) in section 17(a) (sec. 1–1001.17(a), D.C. Official Code), by striking ''except the Delegate to the Congress from the District of Columbia''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect upon the admission of the State into the Union.

SEC. 223. REPEAL OF LAW PROVIDING FOR PARTICIPATION OF SEAT OF GOVERNMENT IN ELECTION OF PRESIDENT AND VICE-PRESIDENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 1 of title 3, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking section 21; and

(2) in the table of sections, by striking the item relating to section 21.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall take effect upon the date of the admission of the State into the Union, and shall apply to any election of the President and Vice-President taking place on or after such date.

SEC. 224. EXPEDITED PROCEDURES FOR CONSIDERATION OF CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT REPEALING 23RD AMENDMENT.

(a) JOINT RESOLUTION DESCRIBED.—In this section, the term ''joint resolution'' means a joint resolution—

(1) entitled ''A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to repeal the 23rd article of amendment''; and

(2) the matter after the resolving clause of which consists solely of text to amend the Constitution of the United States to repeal the 23rd article of amendment to the Constitution.

(b) EXPEDITED CONSIDERATION IN HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.—

(1) PLACEMENT ON CALENDAR.—Upon introduction in the House of Representatives, the joint resolution shall be placed immediately on the appropriate calendar.

(2) PROCEEDING TO CONSIDERATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—It shall be in order, not later than 30 legislative days after the date the joint resolution is introduced in the House of Representatives, to move to proceed to consider the joint resolution in the House of Representatives.

(B) PROCEDURE.—For a motion to proceed to consider the joint resolution—

(i) all points of order against the motion are waived;

(ii) such a motion shall not be in order after the House of Representatives has disposed of a motion to proceed on the joint resolution;

(iii) the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to its adoption without intervening motion;

(iv) the motion shall not be debatable; and

(v) a motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion is disposed of shall not be in order.

(3) CONSIDERATION.—When the House of Representatives proceeds to consideration of the joint resolution—

(A) the joint resolution shall be considered as read;

(B) all points of order against the joint resolution and against its consideration are waived;

(C) the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution to its passage without intervening motion except 10 hours of debate equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent;

(D) an amendment to the joint resolution shall not be in order; and

(E) a motion to reconsider the vote on passage of the joint resolution shall not be in order.

(c) EXPEDITED CONSIDERATION IN SENATE.—

(1) PLACEMENT ON CALENDAR.—Upon introduction in the Senate, the joint resolution shall be placed immediately on the calendar.

(2) PROCEEDING TO CONSIDERATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, it is in order, not later than 30 legislative days after the date the joint resolution is introduced in the Senate (even though a previous motion to the same effect has been disagreed to) to move to proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution.

(B) PROCEDURE.—For a motion to proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution—

(i) all points of order against the motion are waived;

(ii) the motion is not debatable;

(iii) the motion is not subject to a motion to postpone;

(iv) a motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion is agreed to or disagreed to shall not be in order; and

(v) if the motion is agreed to, the joint resolution shall remain the unfinished business until disposed of.

(3) FLOOR CONSIDERATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—If the Senate proceeds to consideration of the joint resolution—

(i) all points of order against the joint resolution (and against consideration of the joint resolution) are waived;

(ii) consideration of the joint resolution, and all debatable motions and appeals in connection therewith, shall be limited to not more than 30 hours, which shall be divided equally between the majority and minority leaders or their designees;

(iii) a motion further to limit debate is in order and not debatable;

(iv) an amendment to, a motion to postpone, or a motion to commit the joint resolution is not in order; and

(v) a motion to proceed to the consideration of other business is not in order.

(B) VOTE ON PASSAGE.—In the Senate the vote on passage shall occur immediately following the conclusion of the consideration of the joint resolution, and a single quorum call at the conclusion of the debate if requested in accordance with the rules of the Senate.

(C) RULINGS OF THE CHAIR ON PROCEDURE.—Appeals from the decisions of the Chair relating to the application of this subsection or the rules of the Senate, as the case may be, to the procedure relating to the joint resolution shall be decided without debate.

(d) RULES RELATING TO SENATE AND HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.—

(1) COORDINATION WITH ACTION BY OTHER HOUSE.—If, before the passage by one House of the joint resolution of that House, that House receives from the other House the joint resolution—

(A) the joint resolution of the other House shall not be referred to a committee; and

(B) with respect to the joint resolution of the House receiving the resolution—

(i) the procedure in that House shall be the same as if no joint resolution had been received from the other House; and

(ii) the vote on passage shall be on the joint resolution of the other House.

(2) TREATMENT OF JOINT RESOLUTION OF OTHER HOUSE.—If one House fails to introduce or consider the joint resolution under this section, the joint resolution of the other House shall be entitled to expedited floor procedures under this section.

(3) TREATMENT OF COMPANION MEASURES.—If, following passage of the joint resolution in the Senate, the Senate receives the companion measure from the House of Representatives, the companion measure shall not be debatable.

(e) RULES OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AND SENATE.—This section is enacted by Congress—

(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate and House of Representatives, respectively, and as such is deemed a part of the rules of each House, respectively, but applicable only with respect to the procedure to be followed in that House in the case of the joint resolution, and supersede other rules only to the extent that it is inconsistent with such rules; and

(2) with full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change the rules (so far as relating to the procedure of that House) at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of that House.

TITLE III—CONTINUATION OF CERTAIN AUTHORITIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

Subtitle A—Employee Benefits

SEC. 301. FEDERAL BENEFIT PAYMENTS UNDER CERTAIN RETIREMENT PROGRAMS.

(a) CONTINUATION OF ENTITLEMENT TO PAYMENTS.—Any individual who, as of the day before the date of the admission of the State into the Union, is entitled to a Federal benefit payment under the District of Columbia Retirement Protection Act of 1997 (subtitle A of title XI of the National Capital Revitalization and Self-Government Improvement Act of 1997; sec. 1–801.01 et seq., D.C. Official Code) shall continue to be entitled to such a payment after the admission of the State into the Union, in the same manner, to the same extent, and subject to the same terms and conditions applicable under such Act.

(b) OBLIGATIONS OF FEDERAL GOVERNMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Any obligation of the Federal Government under the District of Columbia Retirement Protection Act of 1997 which exists with respect to any individual or with respect to the District of Columbia as of the day before the date of the admission of the State into the Union shall remain in effect with respect to such an individual and with respect to the State after the admission of the State into the Union, in the same manner, to the same extent, and subject to the same terms and conditions applicable under such Act.

(2) D.C. FEDERAL PENSION FUND.—Any obligation of the Federal Government under chapter 9 of the District of Columbia Retirement Protection Act of 1997 (sec. 1–817.01 et seq., D.C. Official Code) with respect to the D.C. Federal Pension Fund which exists as of the day before the date of the admission of the State into the Union shall remain in effect with respect to such Fund after the admission of the State into the Union, in the same manner, to the same extent, and subject to the same terms and conditions applicable under such chapter.

(c) OBLIGATIONS OF STATE.—Any obligation of the District of Columbia under the District of Columbia Retirement Protection Act of 1997 which exists with respect to any individual or with respect to the Federal Government as of the day before the date of the admission of the State into the Union shall become an obligation of the State with respect to such an individual and with respect to the Federal Government after the admission of the State into the Union, in the same manner, to the same extent, and subject to the same terms and conditions applicable under such Act.

SEC. 302. CONTINUATION OF FEDERAL CIVIL SERVICE BENEFITS FOR EMPLOYEES FIRST EMPLOYED PRIOR TO ESTABLISHMENT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA MERIT PERSONNEL SYSTEM.

(a) OBLIGATIONS OF FEDERAL GOVERNMENT.—Any obligation of the Federal Government under title 5, United States Code, which exists with respect to an individual described in subsection (c) or with respect to the District of Columbia as of the day before the date of the admission of the State into the Union shall remain in effect with respect to such individual and with respect to the State after the admission of the State into the Union, in the same manner, to the same extent, and subject to the same terms and conditions applicable under such title.

(b) OBLIGATIONS OF STATE.—Any obligation of the District of Columbia under title 5, United States Code, which exists with respect to an individual described in subsection (c) or with respect to the Federal Government as of the day before the date of the admission of the State into the Union shall become an obligation of the State with respect to such individual and with respect to the Federal Government after the admission of the State into the Union, in the same manner, to the same extent, and subject to the same terms and conditions applicable under such title.

(c) INDIVIDUALS DESCRIBED.—An individual described in this subsection is an individual who was first employed by the government of the District of Columbia before October 1, 1987.

SEC. 303. OBLIGATIONS OF FEDERAL GOVERNMENT UNDER JUDGES' RETIREMENT PROGRAM.

(a) CONTINUATION OF OBLIGATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Any obligation of the Federal Government under subchapter III of chapter 15 of title 11, District of Columbia Official Code—

(A) which exists with respect to any individual and the District of Columbia as the result of service accrued prior to the date of the admission of the State into the Union shall remain in effect with respect to such an individual and with respect to the State after the admission of the State into the Union, in the same manner, to the same extent, and subject to the same terms and conditions applicable under such subchapter; and

(B) subject to paragraph (2), shall exist with respect to any individual and the State as the result of service accrued after the date of the admission of the State into the Union in the same manner, to the same extent, and subject to the same terms and conditions applicable under such subchapter as such obligation existed with respect to individuals and the District of Columbia as of the date of the admission of the State into the Union.

(2) TREATMENT OF SERVICE ACCRUED AFTER TAKING EFFECT OF STATE RETIREMENT PROGRAM.—Subparagraph (B) of paragraph (1) does not apply to service accrued on or after the termination date described in subsection (b).

(b) TERMINATION DATE.—The termination date described in this subsection is the date on which the State provides written certification to the President that the State has in effect laws requiring the State to appropriate and make available funds for the retirement of judges of the State.

Subtitle B—Agencies

SEC. 311. PUBLIC DEFENDER SERVICE.

(a) CONTINUATION OF OPERATIONS AND FUNDING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2) and subsection (b), title III of the District of Columbia Court Reform and Criminal Procedure Act of 1970 (sec. 2–1601 et seq., D.C. Official Code) shall apply with respect to the State and to the public defender service of the State after the date of the admission of the State into the Union in the same manner and to the same extent as such title applied with respect to the District of Columbia and the District of Columbia Public Defender Service as of the day before the date of the admission of the State into the Union.

(2) RESPONSIBILITY FOR EMPLOYER CONTRIBUTION.—For purposes of paragraph (2) of section 305(c) of such Act (sec. 2–1605(c)(2), D.C. Official Code), the Federal Government shall be treated as the employing agency with respect to the benefits provided under such section to an individual who is an employee of the public defender service of the State and who, pursuant to section 305(c) of such Act (sec. 2–1605(c), D.C. Official Code), is treated as an employee of the Federal Government for purposes of receiving benefits under any chapter of subpart G of part III of title 5, United States Code.

(b) RENAMING OF SERVICE.—Effective upon the date of the admission of the State into the Union, the State may rename the public defender service of the State.

(c) CONTINUATION OF FEDERAL BENEFITS FOR EMPLOYEES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Any individual who is an employee of the public defender service of the State as of the day before the date described in subsection (d) and who, pursuant to section 305(c) of the District of Columbia Court Reform and Criminal Procedure Act of 1970 (sec. 2–1605(c), D.C. Official Code), is treated as an employee of the Federal Government for purposes of receiving benefits under any chapter of subpart G of part III of title 5, United States Code, shall continue to be treated as an employee of the Federal Government for such purposes, notwithstanding the termination of the provisions of subsection (a) under subsection (d).

(2) RESPONSIBILITY FOR EMPLOYER CONTRIBUTION.—Beginning on the date described in subsection (d), the State shall be treated as the employing agency with respect to the benefits described in paragraph (1) which are provided to an individual who, for purposes of receiving such benefits, is continued to be treated as an employee of the Federal Government under such paragraph.

(d) TERMINATION.—Subsection (a) shall terminate upon the date on which the State provides written certification to the President that the State has in effect laws requiring the State to appropriate and make available funds for the operation of the office of the State which provides the services described in title III of the District of Columbia Court Reform and Criminal Procedure Act of 1970 (sec. 2–1601 et seq., D.C. Official Code).

SEC. 312. PROSECUTIONS.

(a) ASSIGNMENT OF ASSISTANT UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In accordance with subchapter VI of chapter 33 of title 5, United States Code, the Attorney General, with the concurrence of the District of Columbia or the State (as the case may be), shall provide for the assignment of assistant United States attorneys to the State to carry out the functions described in subsection (b).

(2) ASSIGNMENTS MADE ON DETAIL WITHOUT REIMBURSEMENT BY STATE.—In accordance with section 3373 of title 5, United States Code—

(A) an assistant United States attorney who is assigned to the State under this section shall be deemed under subsection (a) of such section to be on detail to a regular work assignment in the Department of Justice; and

(B) the assignment of an assistant United States attorney to the State under this section shall be made without reimbursement by the State of the pay of the attorney or any related expenses.

(b) FUNCTIONS DESCRIBED.—The functions described in this subsection are criminal prosecutions conducted in the name of the State which would have been conducted in the name of the United States by the United States attorney for the District of Columbia or his or her assistants, as provided under section 23–101(c), District of Columbia Official Code, but for the admission of the State into the Union.

(c) MINIMUM NUMBER ASSIGNED.—The number of assistant United States attorneys who are assigned under this section may not be less than the number of assistant United States attorneys whose principal duties as of the day before the date of the admission of the State into the Union were to conduct criminal prosecutions in the name of the United States under section 23–101(c), District of Columbia Official Code.

(d) TERMINATION.—The obligation of the Attorney General to provide for the assignment of assistant United States attorneys under this section shall terminate upon written certification by the State to the President that the State has appointed attorneys of the State to carry out the functions described in subsection (b).

(e) CLARIFICATION REGARDING CLEMENCY AUTHORITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Effective upon the admission of the State into the Union, the authority to grant clemency for offenses against the District of Columbia or the State shall be exercised by such person or persons, and under such terms and conditions, as provided by the State Constitution and the laws of the State, without regard to whether the prosecution for the offense was conducted by the District of Columbia, the State, or the United States.

(2) DEFINITION.—In this subsection, the term ''clemency'' means a pardon, reprieve, or commutation of sentence, or a remission of a fine or other financial penalty.

SEC. 313. SERVICE OF UNITED STATES MARSHALS.

(a) PROVISION OF SERVICES FOR COURTS OF STATE.—The United States Marshals Service shall provide services with respect to the courts and court system of the State in the same manner and to the same extent as the Service provided services with respect to the courts and court system of the District of Columbia as of the day before the date of the admission of the State into the Union, except that the President shall not appoint a United States Marshal under section 561 of title 28, United States Code, for any court of the State.

(b) TERMINATION.—The obligation of the United States Marshals Service to provide services under this section shall terminate upon written certification by the State to the President that the State has appointed personnel of the State to provide such services.

SEC. 314. DESIGNATION OF FELONS TO FACILITIES OF BUREAU OF PRISONS.

(a) CONTINUATION OF DESIGNATION.—Chapter 1 of subtitle C of title XI of the National Capital Revitalization and Self-Government Improvement Act of 1997 (sec. 24–101 et seq., D.C. Official Code) and the amendments made by such chapter—

(1) shall continue to apply with respect to individuals convicted of offenses under the laws of the District of Columbia prior to the date of the admission of the State into the Union; and

(2) shall apply with respect to individuals convicted of offenses under the laws of the State after the date of the admission of the State into the Union in the same manner and to the same extent as such chapter and amendments applied with respect to individuals convicted of offenses under the laws of the District of Columbia prior to the date of the admission of the State into the Union.

(b) TERMINATION.—The provisions of this section shall terminate upon written certification by the State to the President that the State has in effect laws for the housing of individuals described in subsection (a) in correctional facilities.

SEC. 315. PAROLE AND SUPERVISION.

(a) UNITED STATES PAROLE COMMISSION.—

(1) PAROLE.—The United States Parole Commission—

(A) shall continue to exercise the authority to grant, deny, and revoke parole, and to impose conditions upon an order of parole, in the case of any individual who is an imprisoned felon who is eligible for parole or reparole under the laws of the District of Columbia as of the day before the date of the admission of the State into the Union, as provided under section 11231 of the National Capital Revitalization and Self-Government Improvement Act of 1997 (sec. 24–131, D.C. Official Code); and

(B) shall exercise the authority to grant, deny, and revoke parole, and to impose conditions upon an order of parole, in the case of any individual who is an imprisoned felon who is eligible for parole or reparole under the laws of the State in the same manner and to the same extent as the Commission exercised in the case of any individual described in subparagraph (A).

(2) SUPERVISION OF RELEASED OFFENDERS.—The United States Parole Commission—

(A) shall continue to exercise the authority over individuals who are released offenders of the District of Columbia as of the day before the date of the admission of the State into the Union, as provided under section 11233(c)(2) of the National Capital Revitalization and Self-Government Improvement Act of 1997 (sec. 24–133(c)(2), D.C. Official Code); and

(B) shall exercise authority over individuals who are released offenders of the State in the same manner and to the same extent as the Commission exercised authority over individuals described in subparagraph (A).

(3) CONTINUATION OF FEDERAL BENEFITS FOR EMPLOYEES.—

(A) CONTINUATION.—Any individual who is an employee of the United States Parole Commission as of the later of the day before the date described in subparagraph (A) of paragraph (4) or the day before the date described in subparagraph (B) of paragraph (4) and who, on or after such date, is an employee of the office of the

State which exercises the authority described in either such subparagraph, shall continue to be treated as an employee of the Federal Government for purposes of receiving benefits under any chapter of subpart G of part III of title 5, United States Code, notwithstanding the termination of the provisions of this subsection under paragraph (4).

(B) RESPONSIBILITY FOR EMPLOYER CONTRIBUTION.—Beginning on the later of the date described in subparagraph (A) of paragraph (4) or the date described in subparagraph (B) of paragraph (4), the State shall be treated as the employing agency with respect to the benefits described in subparagraph (A) which are provided to an individual who, for purposes of receiving such benefits, is continued to be treated as an employee of the Federal Government under such subparagraph.

(4) TERMINATION.—The provisions of this subsection shall terminate—

(A) in the case of paragraph (1), on the date on which the State provides written certification to the President that the State has in effect laws providing for the State to exercise the authority to grant, deny, and revoke parole, and to impose conditions upon an order of parole, in the case of any individual who is an imprisoned felon who is eligible for parole or reparole under the laws of the State; and

(B) in the case of paragraph (2), on the date on which the State provides written certification to the President that the State has in effect laws providing for the State to exercise authority over individuals who are released offenders of the State.

(b) COURT SERVICES AND OFFENDER SUPERVISION AGENCY.—

(1) RENAMING.—Effective upon the date of the admission of the State into the Union—

(A) the Court Services and Offender Supervision Agency for the District of Columbia shall be known and designated as the Court Services and Offender Supervision Agency for Washington, Douglass Commonwealth, and any reference in any law, rule, or regulation to the Court Services and Offender Supervision Agency for the District of Columbia shall be deemed to refer to the Court Services and Offender Supervision Agency for Washington, Douglass Commonwealth; and

(B) the District of Columbia Pretrial Services Agency shall be known and designated as the Washington, Douglass Commonwealth Pretrial Services Agency, and any reference in any law, rule or regulation to the District of Columbia Pretrial Services Agency shall be deemed to refer to the Washington, Douglass Commonwealth Pretrial Services Agency.

(2) IN GENERAL.—The Court Services and Offender Supervision Agency for Washington, Douglass Commonwealth, including the Washington, Douglass Commonwealth Pretrial Services Agency (as renamed under paragraph (1))—

(A) shall continue to provide pretrial services with respect to individuals who are charged with an offense in the District of Columbia, provide supervision for individuals who are offenders on probation, parole, and supervised release pursuant to the laws of the District of Columbia, and carry out sex offender registration functions with respect to individuals who are sex offenders in the District of Columbia, as of the day before the date of the admission of the State into the Union, as provided under section 11233 of the National Capital Revitalization and Self-Government Improvement Act of 1997 (sec. 24–133, D.C. Official Code); and

(B) shall provide pretrial services with respect to individuals who are charged with an offense in the State, provide supervision for offenders on probation, parole, and supervised release pursuant to the laws of the State, and carry out sex offender registration functions in the State, in the same manner and to the same extent as the Agency provided such services and supervision and carried out such functions for individuals described in subparagraph (A).

(3) CONTINUATION OF FEDERAL BENEFITS FOR EMPLOYEES.—

(A) CONTINUATION.—Any individual who is an employee of the Court Services and Offender Supervision Agency for Washington, Douglass Commonwealth as of the day before the date described in paragraph (4), and who, on or after such date, is an employee of the office of the State which provides the services and carries out the functions described in paragraph (4), shall continue to be treated as an employee of the Federal Government for purposes of receiving benefits under any chapter of subpart G of part III of title 5, United States Code, notwithstanding the termination of the provisions of paragraph (2) under paragraph (4).

(B) RESPONSIBILITY FOR EMPLOYER CONTRIBUTION.—Beginning on the date described in paragraph (4), the State shall be treated as the employing agency with respect to the benefits described in subparagraph (A) which are provided to an individual who, for purposes of receiving such benefits, is continued to be treated as an employee of the Federal Government under such subparagraph.

(4) TERMINATION.—Paragraph (2) shall terminate on the date on which the State provides written certification to the President that the State has in effect laws providing for the State to provide pretrial services, supervise offenders on probation, parole, and supervised release, and carry out sex offender registration functions in the State.

SEC. 316. COURTS.

(a) CONTINUATION OF OPERATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraphs (2) and (3) and subsection (b), title 11, District of Columbia Official Code, as in effect on the date before the date of the admission of the State into the Union, shall apply with respect to the State and the courts and court system of the State after the date of the admission of the State into the Union in the same manner and to the same extent as such title applied with respect to the District of Columbia and the courts and court system of the District of Columbia as of the day before the date of the admission of the State into the Union.

(2) RESPONSIBILITY FOR EMPLOYER CONTRIBUTION.—For purposes of paragraph (2) of section 11–1726(b) and paragraph (2) of section 11–1726(c), District of Columbia Official Code, the Federal Government shall be treated as the employing agency with respect to the benefits provided under such section to an individual who is an employee of the courts and court system of the State and who, pursuant to either such paragraph, is treated as an employee of the Federal Government for purposes of receiving benefits under any chapter of subpart G of part III of title 5, United States Code.

(3) OTHER EXCEPTIONS.—

(A) SELECTION OF JUDGES.—Effective upon the date of the admission of the State into the Union, the State shall select judges for any vacancy on the courts of the State.

(B) RENAMING OF COURTS AND OTHER OFFICES.—Effective upon the date of the admission of the State into the Union, the State may rename any of its courts and any of the other offices of its court system.

(C) RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed—

(i) to affect the service of any judge serving on a court of the District of Columbia on the day before the date of the admission of the State into the Union, or to require the State to select such a judge for a vacancy on a court of the State; or

(ii) to waive any of the requirements of chapter 15 of title 11, District of Columbia Official Code (other than section 11–1501(a) of such Code), including subchapter II of such chapter (relating to the District of Columbia Commission on Judicial Disabilities and Tenure), with respect to the appointment and service of judges of the courts of the State.

(b) CONTINUATION OF FEDERAL BENEFITS FOR EMPLOYEES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Any individual who is an employee of the courts or court system of the State as of the day before the date described in subsection (e) and who, pursuant to section 11–1726(b) or section 11–1726(c), District of Columbia Official Code, is treated as an employee of the Federal Government for purposes of receiving benefits under any chapter of subpart G of part III of title 5, United States Code, shall continue to be treated as an employee of the Federal Government for such purposes, notwithstanding the termination of the provisions of this section under subsection (e).

(2) RESPONSIBILITY FOR EMPLOYER CONTRIBUTION.—Beginning on the date described in subsection (e), the State shall be treated as the employing agency with respect to the benefits described in paragraph (1) which are provided to an individual who, for purposes of receiving such benefits, is continued to be treated as an employee of the Federal Government under such paragraph.

(c) CONTINUATION OF FUNDING.—Section 11241 of the National Capital Revitalization and Self-Government Improvement Act of 1997 (section 11–1743 note, District of Columbia Official Code) shall apply with respect to the State and the courts and court system of the State after the date of the admission of the State into the Union in the same manner and to the same extent as such section applied with respect to the Joint Committee on Judicial Administration in the District of Columbia and the courts and court system of the District of Columbia as of the day before the date of the admission of the State into the Union.

(d) TREATMENT OF COURT RECEIPTS.—

(1) DEPOSIT OF RECEIPTS INTO TREASURY.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), all money received by the courts and court system of the State shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States.

(2) CRIME VICTIMS COMPENSATION FUND.—Section 16 of the Victims of Violent Crime Compensation Act of 1996 (sec. 4–515, D.C. Official Code), relating to the Crime Victims Compensation Fund, shall apply with respect to the courts and court system of the State in the same manner and to the same extent as such section applied to the courts and court system of the District of Columbia as of the day before the date of the admission of the State into the Union.

(e) TERMINATION.—The provisions of this section, other than paragraph (3) of subsection (a) and except as provided under subsection (b), shall terminate on the date on which the State provides written certification to the President that the State has in effect laws requiring the State to appropriate and make available funds for the operation of the courts and court system of the State.

Subtitle C—Other Programs and Authorities

SEC. 321. APPLICATION OF THE COLLEGE ACCESS ACT.

(a) CONTINUATION.—The District of Columbia College Access Act of 1999 (Public Law 106–98; sec. 38–2701 et seq., D.C. Official Code) shall apply with respect to the State, and to the public institution of higher education designated by the State as the successor to the University of the District of Columbia, after the date of the admission of the State into the Union in the same manner and to the same extent as such Act applied with respect to the District of Columbia and the University of the District of Columbia as of the day before the date of the admission of the State into the Union.

(b) TERMINATION.—The provisions of this section, other than with respect to the public institution of higher education designated by the State as the successor to the University of the District of Columbia, shall terminate upon written certification by the State to the President that the State has in effect laws requiring the State to provide tuition assistance substantially

similar to the assistance provided under the District of Columbia College Access Act of 1999.

SEC. 322. APPLICATION OF THE SCHOLARSHIPS FOR OPPORTUNITY AND RESULTS ACT.

(a) CONTINUATION.—The Scholarships for Opportunity and Results Act (division C of Public Law 112–10; sec. 38–1853.01 et seq., D.C. Official Code) shall apply with respect to the State after the date of the admission of the State into the Union in the same manner and to the same extent as such Act applied with respect to the District of Columbia as of the day before the date of the admission of the State into the Union.

(b) TERMINATION.—The provisions of this section shall terminate upon written certification by the State to the President that the State has in effect laws requiring the State—

(1) to provide tuition assistance substantially similar to the assistance provided under the Scholarships for Opportunity and Results Act; and

(2) to provide supplemental funds to the public schools and public charter schools of the State in the amounts provided in the most recent fiscal year for public schools and public charter schools of the State or the District of Columbia (as the case may be) under such Act.

SEC. 323. MEDICAID FEDERAL MEDICAL ASSISTANCE PERCENTAGE.

(a) CONTINUATION.—Notwithstanding section 1905(b) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396d(b)), during the period beginning on the date of the admission of the State into the Union and ending on September 30 of the fiscal year during which the State submits the certification described in subsection (b), the Federal medical assistance percentage for the State under title XIX of such Act shall be the Federal medical assistance percentage for the District of Columbia under such title as of the day before the date of the admission of the State into the Union.

(b) TERMINATION.—The certification described in this subsection is a written certification by the State to the President that, during each of the first 5 fiscal years beginning after the date of the certification, the estimated revenues of the State will be sufficient to cover any reduction in revenues which may result from the termination of the provisions of this section.

SEC. 324. FEDERAL PLANNING COMMISSIONS.

(a) NATIONAL CAPITAL PLANNING COMMISSION.—

(1) CONTINUING APPLICATION.—Subject to the amendments made by paragraphs (2) and (3), upon the admission of the State into the Union, chapter 87 of title 40, United States Code, shall apply as follows:

(A) Such chapter shall apply with respect to the Capital in the same manner and to the same extent as such chapter applied with respect to the District of Columbia as of the day before the date of the admission of the State into the Union.

(B) Such chapter shall apply with respect to the State in the same manner and to the same extent as such chapter applied with respect to the State of Maryland and the Commonwealth of Virginia as of the day before the date of the admission of the State into the Union.

(2) COMPOSITION OF NATIONAL CAPITAL PLANNING COMMISSION.—Section 8711(b) of title 40, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by amending subparagraph (B) of paragraph (1) to read as follows:

''(B) four citizens with experience in city or regional planning, who shall be appointed by the President.''; and

(B) by amending paragraph (2) to read as follows:

''(2) RESIDENCY REQUIREMENT.—Of the four citizen members, one shall be a resident of Virginia, one shall be a resident of Maryland, and one shall be a resident of Washington, Douglass Commonwealth.''.

(3) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS TO DEFINITIONS OF TERMS.—

(A) ENVIRONS.—Paragraph (1) of section 8702 of such title is amended by striking ''the territory surrounding the District of Columbia'' and inserting ''the territory surrounding the National Capital''.

(B) NATIONAL CAPITAL.—Paragraph (2) of section 8702 of such title is amended to read as follows:

''(2) NATIONAL CAPITAL.—The term 'National Capital' means the area serving as the seat of the Government of the United States, as described in section 112 of the Washington, D.C. Admission Act, and the territory the Federal Government owns in the environs.''.

(C) NATIONAL CAPITAL REGION.—Subparagraph (A) of paragraph (3) of section 8702 of such title is amended to read as follows:

''(A) the National Capital and the State of Washington, Douglass Commonwealth;''.

(b) COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS.—

(1) LIMITING APPLICATION TO THE CAPITAL.—Section 9102(a)(1) of title 40, United States Code, is amended by striking ''the District of Columbia'' and inserting ''the Capital''.

(2) DEFINITION.—Section 9102 of such title is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(d) DEFINITION.—In this chapter, the term 'Capital' means the area serving as the seat of the Government of the United States, as described in section 112 of the Washington, D.C. Admission Act.''.

(3) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 9101(d) of such title is amended by striking ''the District of Columbia'' and inserting ''the Capital''.

(c) COMMEMORATIVE WORKS ACT.—

(1) LIMITING APPLICATION TO CAPITAL.—Section 8902 of title 40, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(c) LIMITING APPLICATION TO CAPITAL.—This chapter applies only with respect to commemorative works in the Capital and its environs.''.

(2) DEFINITION.—Paragraph (2) of section 8902(a) of such title is amended to read as follows:

''(2) CAPITAL AND ITS ENVIRONS.—The term 'Capital and its environs' means—

''(A) the area serving as the seat of the Government of the United States, as described in section 112 of the Washington, D.C. Admission Act; and

''(B) those lands and properties administered by the National Park Service and the General Services Administration located in the Reserve, Area I, and Area II as depicted on the map entitled 'Commemorative Areas Washington, DC and Environs', numbered 869/86501 B, and dated June 24, 2003, that are located outside of the State of Washington, Douglass Commonwealth.''.

(3) TEMPORARY SITE DESIGNATION.—Section 8907(a) of such title is amended by striking ''the District of Columbia'' and inserting ''the Capital and its environs''.

(4) GENERAL CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Chapter 89 of such title is amended by striking ''the District of Columbia and its environs'' each place it appears in the following sections and inserting ''the Capital and its environs'':

(A) Section 8901(2) and 8901(4).

(B) Section 8902(a)(4).

(C) Section 8903(d).

(D) Section 8904(c).

(E) Section 8905(a).

(F) Section 8906(a).

(G) Section 8909(a) and 8909(b).

(5) ADDITIONAL CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 8901(2) of such title is amended by striking ''the urban fabric of the District of Columbia'' and inserting ''the urban fabric of the area serving as the seat of the Government of the United States, as described in section 112 of the Washington, D.C. Admission Act''.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section and the amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date of the admission of the State into the Union.

SEC. 325. ROLE OF ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS IN SUPPLYING WATER.

(a) CONTINUATION OF ROLE.—Chapter 95 of title 40, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''§ 9508. Applicability to Capital and State of Washington, Douglass Commonwealth

''(a) IN GENERAL.—Effective upon the admission of the State of Washington, Douglass Commonwealth into the Union, any reference in this chapter to the District of Columbia shall be deemed to refer to the Capital or the State of Washington, Douglass Commonwealth, as the case may be.

''(b) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term 'Capital' means the area serving as the seat of the Government of the United States, as described in section 112 of the Washington, D.C. Admission Act.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections of chapter 95 of such title is amended by adding at the end the following:

''9508. Applicability to Capital and State of Washington, Douglass Commonwealth.''.

SEC. 326. REQUIREMENTS TO BE LOCATED IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

The location of any person in the Capital or Washington, Douglass Commonwealth on the day after the date of the admission of the State into the Union shall be deemed to satisfy any requirement under any law in effect as of the day before the date of the admission of the State into the Union that the person be located in the District of Columbia, including the requirements of section 72 of title 4, United States Code (relating to offices of the seat of the Government of the United States), and title 36, United States Code (relating to patriotic and national organizations).

TITLE IV—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 401. GENERAL DEFINITIONS.

In this Act, the following definitions shall apply:

(1) The term ''Capital'' means the area serving as the seat of the Government of the United States, as described in section 112.

(2) The term ''Council'' means the Council of the District of Columbia.

(3) The term ''Mayor'' means the Mayor of the District of Columbia.

(4) Except as otherwise provided, the term ''State'' means the State of Washington, Douglass Commonwealth.

(5) The term ''State Constitution'' means the proposed Constitution of the State of Washington, D.C., as approved by the Council on October 18, 2016, pursuant to the Constitution and Boundaries for the State of Washington, D.C. Approval Resolution of 2016 (D.C. Resolution R21–621), ratified by District of Columbia voters in Advisory Referendum B approved on November 8, 2016, and certified by the District of Columbia Board of Elections on November 18, 2016.

SEC. 402. STATEHOOD TRANSITION COMMISSION.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established the Statehood Transition Commission (hereafter in this section referred to as the ''Commission'').

(b) COMPOSITION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Commission shall be composed of 18 members as follows:

(A) 3 members appointed by the President.

(B) 2 members appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

(C) 2 members appointed by the Minority Leader of the House of Representatives.

(D) 2 members appointed by the Majority Leader of the Senate.

(E) 2 members appointed by the Minority Leader of the Senate.

(F) 3 members appointed by the Mayor.

(G) 3 members appointed by the Council.

(H) The Chief Financial Officer of the District of Columbia.

(2) APPOINTMENT DATE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The appointments of the members of the Commission shall be made not

later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(B) EFFECT OF LACK OF APPOINTMENT BY APPOINTMENT DATE.—If one or more appointments under any of the subparagraphs of paragraph (1) is not made by the appointment date specified in subparagraph (A), the authority to make such appointment or appointments shall expire, and the number of members of the Commission shall be reduced by the number equal to the number of appointments so not made.

(3) TERM OF SERVICE.—Each member shall be appointed for the life of the Commission.

(4) VACANCY.—A vacancy in the Commission shall be filled in the manner in which the original appointment was made.

(5) NO COMPENSATION.—Members shall serve without pay, but shall receive travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, in accordance with applicable provisions under subchapter I of chapter 57 of title 5, United States Code.

(6) CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR.—The Chair and Vice Chair of the Commission shall be elected by the members of the Commission—

(A) with respect to the Chair, from among the members described in subparagraphs (A) through (E) of paragraph (1); and

(B) with respect to the Vice Chair, from among the members described in subparagraphs (F) and (G) of paragraph (1).

(c) STAFF.—

(1) DIRECTOR.—The Commission shall have a Director, who shall be appointed by the Chair.

(2) OTHER STAFF.—The Director may appoint and fix the pay of such additional personnel as the Director considers appropriate.

(3) NON-APPLICABILITY OF CERTAIN CIVIL SERVICE LAWS.—The Director and staff of the Commission may be appointed without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service, and may be paid without regard to the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of that title relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates, except that an individual so appointed may not receive pay in excess of the rate payable for level V of the Executive Schedule under section 5316 of such title.

(4) EXPERTS AND CONSULTANTS.—The Commission may procure temporary and intermittent services under section 3109(b) of title 5, United States Code, at rates for individuals not to exceed the daily equivalent of the rate payable for level V of the Executive Schedule under section 5316 of such title.

(d) DUTIES.—The Commission shall advise the President, Congress, the Mayor (or, upon the admission of the State into the Union, the chief executive officer of the State), and the Council (or, upon the admission of the State into the Union, the legislature of the State) concerning an orderly transition to statehood for the District of Columbia or the State (as the case may be) and to a reduced geographical size of the seat of the Government of the United States, including with respect to property, funding, programs, projects, and activities.

(e) POWERS.—

(1) HEARINGS AND SESSIONS.—The Commission may, for the purpose of carrying out this Act, hold hearings, sit and act at times and places, take testimony, and receive evidence as the Commission considers appropriate.

(2) OBTAINING OFFICIAL DATA.—The Commission may secure directly from any department or agency of the United States information necessary to enable it to carry out this Act. Upon request of the Chair of the Commission, the head of that department or agency shall furnish that information to the Commission.

(3) MAILS.—The Commission may use the United States mails in the same manner and under the same conditions as other departments and agencies of the United States.

(4) ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT SERVICES.—Upon the request of the Commission, the Administrator of General Services shall provide to the Commission the administrative support services necessary for the Commission to carry out its responsibilities under this Act.

(f) MEETINGS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Commission shall meet at the call of the Chair.

(2) INITIAL MEETING.—The Commission shall hold its first meeting not later than the earlier of—

(A) 30 days after the date on which all members of the Commission have been appointed; or

(B) if the number of members of the Commission is reduced under subsection (b)(2)(B), 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(3) QUORUM.—A majority of the members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum, but a lesser number of members may hold hearings.

(g) REPORTS.—The Commission shall submit such reports as the Commission considers appropriate or as may be requested by the President, Congress, or the District of Columbia (or, upon the admission of the State into the Union, the State).

(h) TERMINATION.—The Commission shall cease to exist 2 years after the date of the admission of the State into the Union.

SEC. 403. CERTIFICATION OF ENACTMENT BY PRESIDENT.

Not more than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall provide written certification of such enactment to the Mayor.

SEC. 404. SEVERABILITY.

Except as provided in section 101(c), if any provision of this Act or amendment made by this Act, or the application thereof to any person or circumstance, is held to be invalid, the remaining provisions of this Act and any amendments made by this Act shall not be affected by the holding.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill, as amended, shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

The gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) and the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. HICE) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on H.R. 51.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia?

There was no objection.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the United States is the only democratic country that denies both voting rights in its national legislature and local autonomy to the residents of its nation's capital.

As we approach July Fourth, it is long past time to apply the Nation's oldest slogan, ''no taxation without representation,'' and the principle of consent of the governed to District of Columbia residents. H.R. 51 would do so, and Congress has both the moral obligation and the constitutional authority to pass the bill.

H.R. 51 would admit the State of Washington, Douglass Commonwealth into the Union and reduce the size of the Federal District. The State would consist of 66 of the 68 square miles of the present-day Federal District.

The reduced Federal District, over which Congress would retain plenary authority, would consist of 2 square miles. The reduced Federal District would consist of the Washington that Members of Congress and visitors associate with the Nation's Capital, including the White House, the Capitol, the Supreme Court, and the principal Federal monuments.

H.R. 51 has both the facts and the Constitution on its side. The Constitution does not establish any prerequisites for new States, but Congress generally has considered three factors in admission decisions: resources and population, support for statehood, and commitment to democracy.

The District pays more Federal taxes per capita than any State and pays more Federal taxes than 22 States of the Union. The District's population of 705,000 is larger than those of Wyoming and Vermont, and the new State would be one of the seven States with a population under 1 million.

D.C.'s $15.5 billion budget is larger than those of 12 States, and the District's AAA bond rating is higher than those of 35 States. D.C. has a higher per capita personal income and gross domestic product than any State.

Eighty-six percent of D.C. residents voted in favor of statehood in 2016. In fact, D.C. residents have been fighting for voting rights in Congress and local autonomy for 219 years.

The Constitution's Admissions Clause gives Congress the authority to admit new States, and all 37 new States have been admitted by an act of Congress. The Constitution's District Clause, which gives Congress plenary authority over the Federal District, sets a maximum size of the Federal District of 100 square miles. It does not set a minimum size. Congress previously has changed the size of the Federal District, including by reducing it 30 percent in 1846.

Over the last few months, the Nation, and even the world, has witnessed discriminatory and outrageous treatment of D.C. residents by the Federal Government.

In March, Congress passed the CARES Act, which deprived the District of $755 million in coronavirus fiscal relief by treating the District as a territory rather than a State. The HEROES Act, passed by the House in May, would restore those funds.

This month, Federal police and out-of-State National Guard troops occupied D.C., without the consent of the D.C. Mayor, to respond to largely peaceful protests. Prior to this occupation of the city, there had been much more looting and property destruction in other cities, but the Federal Government did not occupy those cities. The Federal occupation occurred solely because the President thought that he could get away with it. He was wrong.

For me, H.R. 51 is deeply personal. My great-grandfather, Richard Holmes,

who escaped as a slave from Virginia on a plantation, made it as far as D.C., a walk to freedom but not to equal citizenship. For three generations, my family has been denied the rights other Americans take for granted.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself an additional 1 minute.

Congress has two choices: It can continue to exercise undemocratic or autocratic authority over the 705,000 American citizens who reside in our Nation's capital, treating them, in the words of Frederick Douglass, as ''aliens; not citizens, but subjects''; or Congress can live up to this Nation's promise and ideals and pass H.R. 51.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Speaker NANCY PELOSI, Majority Leader STENY HOYER, Majority Whip JAMES CLYBURN, Chairwoman CAROLYN MALONEY, and the late Elijah Cummings, our millions of allies across the country, and, most importantly, generations of D.C. residents and officials who have refused to simply accept their treatment as second-class citizens for bringing us to this historic day.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on H.R. 51, and I reserve the balance of my time.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDCIARY,
Washington, DC, June 18, 2020.

Hon. CAROLYN B. MALONEY,
Chairwoman, Committee on Oversight and Reform, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRWOMAN MALONEY: This is to advise you that the Committee on the Judiciary has now had an opportunity to review the provisions in H.R. 5803, the ''Washington, D.C. Admission Act,'' that fall within our Rule X jurisdiction. I appreciate your consulting with us on those provisions. The Judiciary Committee has no objection to your including them in the bill for consideration on the House floor, and to expedite that consideration is willing to forgo action on H.R. 5803, with the understanding that we do not thereby waive any future jurisdictional claim over those provisions or their subject matters.

In the event a House-Senate conference on this or similar legislation is convened, the Judiciary Committee reserves the right to request an appropriate number of conferees to address any concerns with these or similar provisions that may arise in conference.

Please place this letter into the Congressional Record during consideration of the measure on the House floor. Thank you for the cooperative spirit in which you have worked regarding this matter and others between our committees.

Sincerely,

JERROLD NADLER,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND REFORM,
Washington, DC, June 22, 2020.

Hon. JERROLD NADLER,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 5803, the Washington D.C. Admission Act. As you know, the bill was referred primarily to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, with an additional referral to the Committee on the Judiciary.

I thank you for allowing the Committee on the Judiciary to be discharged from further consideration of the bill to expedite floor consideration. This discharge in no way affects your jurisdiction over the subject matter of the bill, and it will not serve as precedent for future referrals. In addition, should a conference on the bill be necessary, I would support your request to have the Committee on the Judiciary represented on the conference committee.

I would be pleased to include this letter and your correspondence in the Congressional Record during floor consideration to memorialize our understanding.

Sincerely,

CAROLYN B. MALONEY,
Chairwoman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE,
Washington, DC, June 19, 2020.

Hon. CAROLYN B. MALONEY,
Chairwoman, Committee on Oversight and Reform, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRWOMAN MALONEY: I write concerning H.R. 5803, the ''Washington, D.C. Admission Act,'' which was additionally referred to the Committee on Energy and Commerce (Committee). There are certain provisions in the legislation which concern the Medicaid federal medical assistance percentage for a newly admitted state and fall within the Rule X jurisdiction of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

In recognition of the desire to expedite consideration of H.R. 5803, the Committee agrees to waive formal consideration of the bill as to such provisions. The Committee takes this action with the mutual understanding that we do not waive any jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in this or similar legislation, and that the Committee will be appropriately consulted and involved as this bill or similar legislation moves forward so that we may address any remaining issues within our jurisdiction. I request that you urge the Speaker to name Members of the Committee to any conference committee which is named to consider such provision. Such participation will be critical to allow the Committee to continue to work on the policy involving the Medicaid federal medical assistance percentage for a newly admitted state.

Finally, I would appreciate the inclusion of this letter into the Congressional Record during floor consideration of H.R. 5803.

Sincerely,

FRANK PALLONE, Jr.,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND REFORM,
Washington, DC, June 22, 2020.

Hon. FRANK PALLONE,
Chairman, Committee on Energy and Commerce, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 5803, the Washington D.C. Admission Act. As you know, the bill was referred primarily to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, with an additional referral to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, due to provisions in the legislation which concern the Medicaid federal medical assistance percentage for a newly admitted state.

I thank you for allowing the Committee on Energy and Commerce to be discharged from further consideration of the bill to expedite floor consideration. This discharge in no way affects your jurisdiction over the subject matter of the bill, and it will not serve as precedent for future referrals. In addition, should a conference on the bill be necessary, I would support your request to have the Committee on Energy and Commerce represented on the conference committee.

I would be pleased to include this letter and your correspondence in the Congressional Record during floor consideration to memorialize our understanding.

Sincerely,

CAROLYN B. MALONEY,
Chairwoman.

Mr. HICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 51, the Washington, D.C. Admission Act.

There is a whole lot more to statehood than simply being a large and vibrant city. Our Nation's Founders made it clear that D.C. is not meant to be a State. They thought about it, they debated it, and they rejected it. In fact, in those early days, Alexander Hamilton himself proposed an amendment that would allow the District residents to have a voting Member in the House, and that proposal was rejected.

If the majority wishes to go against our Founders, that is their prerogative, but they should simply admit, in their opinion, the Founders were wrong. They cannot ignore the intention behind D.C.'s current status. The Constitution simply does not allow city governments to become microstates with all the rights and responsibilities of full States. The debate about the nature of Washington, D.C., is not a new debate, but it is absolutely a settled one.

My friends on the other side of the aisle may gasp and protest in outrage at the suggestion that what this is really all about is an attempt to get two more Democratic Senators. That is what this really is all about.

On our side, there is no question that we have the Constitution on our side on this whole debate. The Constitution clearly establishes a federation of sovereign States, and representation here in Washington, D.C., comes from those States, the federation of those States. This District is a unique entity. It was set apart to not be influenced by a State, but to, in itself, be governed by those representatives of the various States who are here.

Our Founders did not want this city, the seat of our Federal Government, to be influenced by any other State, but that is exactly what this proposal would do.

As James Madison expressed it himself in Federalist 43, if the Nation's Capital City were situated within a State, the Federal Government could be subject to undue influence of that State. That is not the intent of our Federal Government; that is not the intent of this District that has been set aside; and that is exactly what would happen under this bill.

My colleagues across the aisle believe that excluding a small Federal enclave from this new State would nullify the need for a constitutional amendment, but that is simply not true. The original text of the Constitution is clear.

Congress has the power to create States from two sources: a territory or

an existing State that agrees to secede its territory to become a State. Washington, D.C., is neither of these. It is the Nation's only Federal District, and it is set aside for a specific purpose. Congress does not have the authority to take this District and create a State out of it. At least one constitutional amendment would be required for that to happen.

During the markup of this bill, I personally raised these constitutional concerns and offered an amendment to provide an expedited procedure to deal with the constitutional amendment, but the Oversight Committee Democrats opposed that amendment, and they opposed, in fact, all of our amendments that were put forth.

This is not a surprise that this whole proposal has been rejected by the American people.

□ 0930

In fact, in a Gallup Poll last year, 64 percent of Americans reject the idea of D.C. being a State, only 29 percent approve of it.

Granting D.C. statehood goes against not only the American citizens' desires, but more importantly, against the Constitution itself and certainly our Framers' original intent.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues in the House to oppose the Washington, D.C. Admissions Act.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY), chairwoman of the House Committee on Oversight and Reform, and I thank her for the way she conducted hearings on H.R. 51.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON), and my good friend, for her years of leadership on this bill. She is not only the author of the bill, but of this historic day for our democracy.

For the first time in a generation, the House will vote today on whether hundreds of thousands of American citizens will finally have their voices counted in Congress.

We will vote to honor the most fundamental principles of this Nation and for which a revolution was launched: no taxation without representation and consent of the governed.

I can think of no more honorable or patriotic endeavor than taking up this legislation today to give the people of the District the same rights enjoyed by hundreds of millions of other Americans across our country.

The United States is a democracy, but its capital is not. The United States is the only democratic country that denies both voting rights in the national legislature and local self-government to the people of the capital. That is wrong and violates everything we stand for as Americans.

The District pays more in Federal taxes than 22 States and more per capita than any State. Think about that. It pays more than nearly half the States in this country, yet D.C. residents have no vote in Congress, and that is wrong.

The people of the District have been fighting for equal rights for more than 200 years. In 2016, an overwhelming 86 percent of D.C. residents voted for statehood.

President Trump's recent decision to deploy thousands of Federal law enforcement officers in D.C. against residents peacefully exercising their constitutionally-protected right to protest, and without the consent of the District's elected officials, demonstrated the urgent need for full local government and congressional representation.

Unfortunately, so far, Republicans have opposed our effort, and the President made clear exactly why: they would rather deny voting rights for hundreds of thousands of American citizens than even consider the possibility that representatives from the new State could be Democrats.

Now, think about that argument. They are willing to violate the core principles of our democracy merely because they may be from a different political party. This argument is anti-democratic and un-American.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from New York.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. The questions for Republicans are these: Do they truly believe in taxation without representation? Do they truly believe in States' rights? Do they truly believe the Federal Government should stay out of local affairs? If they do, then join us and act on these beliefs today. This bill should be bipartisan.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge every Member to vote on H.R. 51 for the soon-to-be 51st State of our great country.

Mr. HICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would just remind the chairwoman that the entire court system of Washington, D.C., is supported by the Federal Government.

And there is representation. This District has three electoral votes. No other city in the country has that. There is a representative here.

It is just an amazing thing, too, that this whole bill does not even allow elections for the new Governor that is proposed here, so the very thing they are arguing, they reject and deny from the residents.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MURPHY), my good friend.

Mr. MURPHY of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in opposition to H.R. 51.

Voting against this legislation is not an economic, racial, or a social injustice, as my colleagues across the aisle may unfairly claim. I have no doubt that my Democratic friends, just like Republicans, want the citizens of Washington to have political rights like every other American. However, let's talk about what is honest here. Let's just be honest.

The true goal here is to have two virtually guaranteed new Democratic seats so that D.C. can become a State. That is what it comes down to. That is the goal.

Why do I say that? Because there is a much simpler alternative that I am baffled that the Democrats do not want anything to do with. I offered an amendment to this bill that would retrocede the District of Columbia back to Maryland. That is where the land came from.

Congress ceded the west side of the Potomac, now Alexandria, from the District of Columbia back to Virginia in 1847. So there is plenty of historical precedent for this action.

Unfortunately, despite making total sense, my amendment was, sadly, blocked.

If D.C. were ceded back to Maryland, citizens can vote for Members of the House of Representatives and Senate in Maryland. They would have congressional representation in both Chambers, with the exact effect of statehood.

The move is simply unnecessary, when ceding D.C. back to Maryland is a viable, cost-effective, and common-sense option.

To further nullify this debate, the District of Columbia would require a constitutional amendment to change. The Framers of the Constitution, as has been said before, were very clear about this. The Supreme Court reaffirmed this in 1949.

So why are we trying to overturn the Supreme Court? One answer: politics, pure and simple.

Even setting aside the obvious need for a constitutional amendment, my colleagues across the aisle know that this legislation has no chance of becoming law. It is just the majority's attempt, again, to message bills to satisfy the base.

Let me be clear: Republicans do not want to attempt to stifle voices or suppress representation.

If the D.C. citizens want to have representation, then cede the land back to Maryland, because I have demonstrated it is a more hands-down, more practical solution.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to note that the gentleman's amendment to cede the District of Columbia back to Maryland did not have the consent of Maryland.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY), my good friend.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend, ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON, who is managing today's bill to right a wrong, but unfortunately, because D.C. does not have a vote here in the Congress, she won't be able to cast a vote on final passage of her own bill.

Today, we are being asked to right a wrong. And you hear the contortions on the other side of the aisle to continue to justify a fundamental right being denied 700,000 fellow Americans who pay taxes, who fight in our wars and serve in government, who have families, who are Americans, but have no votes in the United States Congress. They are bigger than five States.

They hide behind the Constitution. The Constitution was written before they even knew where the capital of the United States would be, before a blade of grass was touched to construct Washington, D.C. No one at that time could have envisioned the metropolis of 700,000 Americans, let alone that they would be denied their fundamental American right.

Let's cede it to Maryland. Two problems: Maryland doesn't want D.C. and D.C. doesn't want to be in Maryland. The consent of the governed is a fundamental part of the American architecture, which you conveniently overlook.

And then there is the right to be represented, another fundamental right denied D.C.

Mr. Speaker, it is partisan politics, yes. It is theirs. They want to deny 700,000 people their right to representation in this body and in the other body because of their politics, or likely politics.

When have we ever done that as America? We haven't looked at how people would vote before we decide to incorporate them into the Union as a State. We understood the right of people to petition to become a State, and Congress has that power.

Let's right a wrong, especially in the post-George Floyd world, and give people their rightful representation in the people's body and in the Senate.

Mr. HICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. COMER), my good friend and a great member of the Oversight Committee.

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. HICE) for his great leadership on this issue.

At a time when Speaker PELOSI is keeping Congress largely on the sidelines, it is unfortunate that we are spending precious work time debating blatantly unconstitutional legislation.

Not only is this measure unconstitutional and dead on arrival in the Senate, but it should not be a priority for this body right now. Our Nation is facing a serious need for action. We need police reform that focuses on transparency and accountability, we need to support American workers as States safely reopen their communities and economies, and we need to ensure that money we have spent to fight the coronavirus is effectively guarded against waste, fraud, and abuse.

Passing this measure today would signal a stunning lack of respect for the Constitution. Making Washington, D.C., a State would specifically violate the intentions of our Founding Fathers, who wanted the national seat of government to belong to no State.

In fact, the Constitution specifically calls for Congress, not any State government, to have authority over the District serving as the seat of Federal Government.

Granting statehood for Washington, D.C., requires a constitutional amendment, just as granting the District three electoral college votes required the ratification of the 23rd Amendment.

It is time for Congress to get back to full-time work and take up the pressing issues facing our country, not playing unconstitutional games.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN), my good friend and neighbor.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, when in the course of human events a relationship stops working and one party experiences a long train of abuses and indignities at the hands of the other, you scrap the old relationship and you start anew.

It is nothing personal, but I wish our GOP colleagues in the House and Senate could recognize that this just isn't working out anymore for the people of Washington. The relationship you have taken for granted for so long with the local population is dysfunctional and, frankly, abusive.

Plainly put, the people of Washington want out.

It is not just the pepper spray and the tear gas and the rubber bullets; it is not just crashing their churches and desecrating their religion with your photo-ops; it is not just the use of their sons and daughters in the National Guard to put down protests by their sons and daughters in the streets; it is not just the threats to Federalize their local police or the decision to overturn their adoption laws, their marijuana laws, and their health funding choices; or your control of their judges and prosecutors; or the constant Presidential insults leveled against their chosen leaders; it is not that the GOP Members who claim to be the attentive partners of the District never listen to the people here, never go to their local meetings, don't know the mayor or the city council or the ANC members; it is not even the $750 million that they just cheated the people of Washington out of in the middle of this plague.

It is something deeper. It is not just something you did.

The people of Washington have found someone and something else. They have voted to break up this dysfunctional relationship with Congress to start a healthy and respectful relationship with America.

In America, States make their own local policy and budget decisions without constant tampering and interference by other people's representatives.

In America, every political community stands on equal footing through statehood. Each one sends two Senators to the U.S. Senate and voting representatives to the House, delegations that guarantee no one will push their people around.

□ 0945

When you are a State, you help decide things like whether your country goes to war, who will be your judges and supreme court justices, how will your Federal tax dollars get spent, and what should be the laws of the Nation.

The only question now is whether Congress is mature enough, is man enough, to deal with the fact that Washington no longer wants to be under our thumb. A mature and faithful Congress that wants the best for all of its people is not afraid of statehood. We celebrate it. We delight in it.

America started as 13 States, but we have exercised our powers under Article IV, Section 3, 37 separate times to admit 37 new States, all of them by simple legislative acts, none of them by constitutional amendment, and each one was controversial in its own way.

I heard the gentleman say that you have to be either a territory or formally part of another State to be admitted as a State. It is not true. I have a one-word answer to that: Texas. It was its own independent country. It was a republic, and people said that was unconstitutional and Congress said: No, we are going to favor the trajectory of democratic inclusion and political equality.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Maryland an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. RASKIN. So every State has faced objections. They said Utah was too Mormon, and New Mexico was too Catholic. Hawaii and Alaska, in 1959, of course, they weren't contiguous; they couldn't be admitted.

Yes, the District exists now under Article I, Section 8, Clause 17, but the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia proposes to shrink the Federal district the way it was shrunk in 1847 because the slave masters of Virginia wanted the land back in advance of congressional abolition of the slave traffic in the District.

If we can modify the boundaries of the Federal district to placate the slave masters in the 19th century, we can modify the boundaries of the Federal district in the 21st century to grant statehood and equal rights to the people of Washington, D.C.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. HICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I will just remind my good friend, listen, we share the concern if people are upset, if it is not working. But the reality is, if it is not working, we have a system in this government, in our system, to deal with it. And in this case, it is called a constitutional amendment.

Why the Democrats are not presenting a constitutional amendment to

deal with the problem is beyond me, but it is what it is.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR), my good friend.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 51 and its affront to the Constitution.

The Founding Fathers did not intend for Washington, D.C., to be a State. Article I, Section 8, Clause 17 of the United States Constitution provides Congress with exclusive jurisdiction over the District of Columbia. The enclave clause was included for specific reasons, notably the fact that the operation of the seat of the Federal Government of the United States, whose laws now affect approximately 330 million Americans, should not be impeded by local ordinances, actions, or taxation.

The Framers of the Constitution had good reason for this concern, having witnessed the reluctance of local authorities to police disorderly conduct by protesters in June of 1783, conduct that forced the adjournment of Congress and the flight of its Members to neighboring States. We see similar situations playing out in the streets today, right here in Washington, D.C.

Passage of this vote today violates the Constitution in two different ways: first, withdrawing specifically enumerated powers granting Congress control of the Federal district; and, two, ignoring the constitutional amendment process the Framers outlined to make changes to our founding charter.

Yesterday, I testified on my amendment to the Rules Committee, which reaffirmed and enhanced congressional leadership over the District provided in the District of Columbia Home Rule Act. Unfortunately, my colleagues did not accept this amendment, which was crafted in the spirit of the Constitution, pushing this legislation and the legal thought behind it even further away from our founding tradition.

The last few months have been very difficult times in this country, with unrest spanning throughout our Nation, including right here inside Washington, D.C., itself. In the face of willful disregard for the rule of law, it is irresponsible for this body to follow in these footsteps by blatantly taking action against our Constitution.

The democratic and legal wisdom of our Founders is unprecedented, and their calls for a legal charter, which granted and preserved individual liberties and good governance, stand true today. Going against their intentions now is neither prudent nor in the best interest of the country.

I urge my colleagues to vote against H.R. 51.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding and for her tremendous leadership over time to remove obstacles of participation to our democracy, whether it is a voting rights act for all, or whether it is observing the 100th anniversary of women having the right to vote, and whether it is about giving full participation in our democracy to the District of Columbia.

I am proud to join her in wearing this mask. It says ''51st,'' and that is why this legislation is H.R. 51, D.C. statehood, which I will talk about now.

But Congresswoman ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON has been brilliant, relentless, persistent, dissatisfied about the lack of full participation for her constituents in the work of Congress. So I salute her as the patron saint and guiding star of D.C. statehood, even before she came to Congress, but since she came to Congress, she has worked tirelessly and relentlessly to build historic support for this bill. She gives us the honor of participating in this historic vote, wherein the House of Representatives, for the first time, will vote for statehood for the District.

D.C. statehood, Mr. Speaker, is both an official and a personal priority for me. My colleagues have heard me say this, but I will say it again. When I was born, my father was a Member of Congress from Baltimore, Maryland. He was on the Appropriations Committee, and he served as the chair of the D.C. appropriations subcommittee.

At that time, they tell me, that person would be regarded as the mayor, unofficial mayor, of Washington because that Appropriations Committee made all the decisions, so many decisions, for the District of Columbia. He was a big supporter of home rule, seeing from that perspective the unfairness of it all, a big supporter of home rule.

In any event, he did his job in a way to try to make a path, and it passed; then later, home rule; then later a mayor and the rest; and now, to where we are now.

Yesterday, someone said: Can you find middle ground? This is middle ground, the status quo. We have to go forward.

I later had the privilege of serving on the Appropriations Committee, on the District of Columbia subcommittee, and I saw the obstacles to home rule that some in our Congress would put forth, diminishing the self-determination that the people of the District of Columbia should have.

Statehood for the District is about showing respect for our democracy. It is not just about the District. It is about our democracy, for the American people and for our U.S. Constitution, yes.

The Constitution begins with our beautiful preamble, ''We the People,'' setting out our Founder's vision of a government of, by, and for the people of the United States. It doesn't say, ''except for the District of Columbia.''

Yet, for more than two centuries, the residents of Washington, D.C., have been denied their right to fully participate in our democracy. Instead, they have been dealt the injustice of paying taxes, serving in the military, and contributing to the economic power of our Nation, while being denied the full enfranchisement that is their right. Serving in the military, fighting, risking their lives for our democracy, fundamental to that democracy is representative government. They were willing to risk their lives for a principle, for a value, for our democracy, while where they lived was being denied that full opportunity.

Today, by passing H.R. 51, the Washington, D.C. Admission Act, to admit the State of Washington, Douglass Commonwealth—State of Washington, Douglass Commonwealth—to the Union—that would be Frederick Douglass, from Maryland but who lived in the District of Columbia, an abolitionist and a suffragist, actually. He was in Seneca Falls at the Conference of Women, coming together for women having the right to vote, so much about our democracy and voting for all Americans.

In doing so today, we will bring our Nation closer to the founding ideals that all are created equal and all deserve a say in our democracy.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a bipartisan vote, I hope, again, but a strong vote in the House for this very important legislation, legislation important to our democracy, to our Constitution.

I thank, again, and salute ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON for her leadership, working with our distinguished leader, Mr. HOYER, for whom this has been a priority. I am proud that this is on the floor today.

Mr. HICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time I have remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia has 18½ minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from the District of Columbia has 14 minutes remaining.

Mr. HICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I would just say again that our Constitution has representation here in our Capitol from the Federation of the States, and this district was set apart, not to be a State, nor to be influenced by one.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. MASSIE), a great member of the Oversight and Reform Committee.

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Speaker, if there is a constitutional way to turn D.C. into a State, this bill is not it. This bill is a farcical exercise in legislative virtue signaling because it contains a fatal constitutional flaw.

Let's talk about what this bill doesn't do. This bill doesn't magically convert all of D.C. into a State. This bill doesn't create a new State containing a city called D.C. Because both of these clearly violate the Constitution.

Some overly clever legislative artists think they have found a new loophole, a way to create a State in D.C. without violating the Constitution. What this bill does is it seeks to shrink the city

of D.C. into a tiny city, and then creates a State from the territory that is left over.

The problem with that is there is the 23rd Amendment to the Constitution that gives the city of D.C. presently three electoral votes. Paradoxically, the bill itself acknowledges the constitutional flaw within because it contains an expedited procedure to vote on the repeal of the 23rd Amendment in this Chamber and the Senate Chamber.

The problem is, the bill keeps plowing forward and would create a new State, even if the 23rd Amendment is not repealed. This creates the farcical situation where the few residents, which are the residents at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, the First Family, would control three electoral votes. This is crazy.

So, I urge my colleagues to vote for the Constitution today and vote against H.R. 51.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, the last thing we have to be concerned about is whether or not the 23rd Amendment will be repealed, and the bill, H.R. 51, contains an expedited procedure for that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), my good neighbor and good friend, the majority leader of the House of Representatives.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I am going to leave my mask on, not only because it is the safe thing to do for all of you—not for me, for you—but also because it represents the best of America.

I am from Maryland. Maryland was a slaveholding State. I represent the district that probably had the most slaves, along with my friend from the First Congressional District.

□ 1000

In fact, there were many sympathizers for the Southern cause that would have had Marylanders join the Confederacy. They were, of course, wrong. But I want to tell my friends from those States that withdrew and whose States tried to destroy the Union that they ought to remember that this Nation took them back without condition with full citizenship and the right to vote. Surely we can do the same for our fellow citizens.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this bill, and I thank Delegate ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON in her extraordinary quest keeping her eye on the prize to make sure that the citizens she represents have full citizenship and have our respect. I am proud to stand with her in supporting statehood for the people of the District of Columbia.

On this mask, there is a drawing of the outline of the District of Columbia. That is Maryland before the 1789 and subsequent actions. That was Maryland. I daresay, there is not a Marylander who voted on that secession of that land for the Capital of the United States who thought to themselves they were disenfranchising those who lived in that District.

I want to thank Mayor Bowser, with whom I have been proud to work to move this issue forward with the leadership of Delegate Holmes Norton. I made clear when we announced that the House would consider this bill today that the people who call our Nation's Capital home have been disenfranchised and shortchanged too long.

Martin Luther King said: How long?

Too long.

Not only have the residents of one of America's most historically African-American cities—let me repeat that—historically, it is one of our largest African-American cities. It is not exclusive. It is a diverse city. Very frankly, it does not make a decision, if you don't vote for us, we will not allow you to vote.

Hear me: If you don't vote for us, we will not allow you to vote.

But President Trump says that my friends on the other side of the aisle, Mr. Speaker, would be foolish to vote for this bill. Why? Because we are too Democratic and we wouldn't vote for you.

What do you think the North would have done with the 11 States that tried to destroy the Union if we had said: You are not going to vote for us, so you can't come back—at least, you can't come back with voting rights, and we will keep you as subjects, not as citizens?

I hope every Member who represents one of those States thinks about that proposition as you vote to exclude 706,000 of your fellow citizens from full participation in our democracy.

Not only have the residents of one of America's great cities been prevented from having full citizenship, but they have also been shortchanged in the money that we give them. Just recently, COVID–19, we gave them 40 percent of what we gave Wyoming, an entity 200,000 people smaller than the District of Columbia.

I see no heads shaking on the other side of the aisle, Mr. Speaker. I see no agreement on that.

Should we say Wyoming is too small and that we ought to exclude Wyoming, it is not big enough to be a State?

Yet Wyoming, more than 10 times smaller than the State of Maryland and, as opposed to 40 million people in California, 500,000, one-eightieth of the size, have two United States Senators.

Stand up if you think Wyoming ought not to have a vote.

I see no one standing.

This constitutional argument is a Don Quixote windmill argument. These are 706,000 American citizens. At the same time, their elected leaders can be overruled by Congress and by the President when it comes to local issues, as we saw when President Trump ordered Federal law enforcement and the National Guard to suppress peaceful and legitimate protest against the killing of Black men and women in encounters with the police and with others. George Zimmerman comes to mind and Trayvon Martin.

This is about human rights. This is about democracy. This is about our Nation being better than that.

I see my colleague from Maryland shaking his head. We disagree.

The people of D.C. deserve not only real self-government, but also full representation in the Congress of the United States.

Are these 700,000 people less than the 500,000 people in Wyoming?

If we ask somebody to come to the District of Columbia and work for our government, is the condition that they lose their citizenship, that they lose their full voting rights? Is that the condition we put on them? If so, I respectfully disagree with my colleagues who believe that is what America is about.

That is what this historic legislation would do, admit Washington, D.C., as the 51st State. That would provide residents of the District of Columbia with a voting House Member and two Senators, as every other group of Americans who lives in a jurisdiction called a State has the right to have.

It would right a historical wrong to ensure that our Founders' vision of representative government will be enacted for all Americans, no longer excluding the 706,000 in the District of Columbia.

The House will take action today to make the District of Columbia a State. It is an historic day.

Be on the right side of history. So many voted against the Civil Rights Act of the 1960s and years thereafter. They were on the wrong side of history.

The gentleman is absolutely right. Somebody mentioned it was Democrats. We were a segregationist party. And guess what? We said we do not want to be that kind of party, and Hubert Humphrey got up in 1948 in New York at a Democratic convention and said that we need to come out of the dark shadows of slavery and segregation into the bright sunlight of justice and equality.

Yes, I understand that was our party. We said to them: We do not want to be that party.

Don't you be that party. Don't you have Lincoln turn over in his grave and say: That is not our party.

Yes, I heard the gentleman over there. Sadly, in the denial of democracy, the Republican-led Senate has indicated, Mr. Speaker, it will not act, just as it has not acted on 275 bipartisan bills that we have sent to the United States Senate. They will not act.

The majority of the Senate is elected by 18 percent of the American people. That is unfortunate, Mr. Speaker, because this is more than just a local issue for the District of Columbia. It is a civil rights issue for our country, as yesterday was a civil rights issue for our country.

It is something that ought to concern all Americans, because when some Americans are denied the full rights and representation of citizenship, it diminishes the meaning of citizenship for

all. Statehood is not merely a status; it is a recognition by the rest of the States of the sovereign equality of the people who live there that they are part of the main, not simply an island, as the poet reflected, and that they cannot be treated as lesser by their fellow citizens.

By admitting Washington, D.C., as a State, we will admit what we already know to be true: that its people are our fellow Americans, equal in their pursuit of happiness and their enjoyment of the full rights and privileges of American citizenship, including representation in the Congress of the United States.

Our patriot forebears in the 18th century used to cry out, ''No taxation without representation.''

The citizens of Boston stole some tea, a criminal act, and they threw it into the Boston Harbor. Why? They said: Because we will not be taxed without representation and that King George cannot tell us what to do without consulting us.

Be on the right side of history. Washington residents correctly still use that battle cry in the 21st century. Let us make it ring true at last. Let us make our Union of States a more perfect one by adding to its number as we have 37 times consistent with the Constitution.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to stand up for America, stand up for democracy, and stand up for the premise of America that every person counts. Vote ''yes.''

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TRONE). Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. HICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I feel like the arguments on the other side of the aisle are so weak that they respond by yelling louder.

We have just heard a great, passionate speech about something that is totally irrelevant. In fact, the point was highlighted that the condition for statehood is not population; otherwise, we would not have States like Wyoming or Alaska or other States that were ever admitted. That is not the issue. The issue was that Washington, D.C., was set apart as a seat of government not to be the same as the federation of States that our Constitution grants us.

Mr. HOYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HICE of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much for his respect.

Is the gentleman aware that the District of Columbia was reduced in size historically a while back so that the land was reduced?

This is what is happening here. There is clear precedent for doing this.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. HICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROY), who is my good friend and a great leader.

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia for yielding.

I appreciate the opportunity to address this important issue and the question the gentleman from Maryland just asked. I hear the question.

Yes, their District boundary lines have changed in the past, but what the majority wants to do today is fundamentally alter what Washington, D.C., is. That is what is at stake here.

I would love to hear the gentleman from Maryland expound on his support and belief in our electoral college since, suddenly, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have a newfound respect for the power of States and the importance of States. I would love to hear them expound on that.

I would love to hear my colleagues on the other side of the aisle talk about what is critical about community and about respecting the ability of people to live differently in order for us to agree to disagree, to allow Texas to be Texas, California to be California. I would like love to hear my colleagues on the other side of the aisle expound on these principles.

This is about power. That is what this is about. Let's make no mistake about it. D.C., I do not believe, should become a State—and I use that word importantly, should not become a State.

We can talk about the constitutional infirmities with what the majority is trying to do. My colleagues are doing that, and they have laid that out.

The Constitution speaks to creating the Federal city in Washington, D.C. The Founders wanted to do that for a reason. We wanted this seat to be completely unintertwined and separated from other States. We wanted it to be special and unique and not subject to the powers and the struggles that go on about the people in a certain State. That is what is at stake here.

I would note that my friends, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. HOYER, and Mr. BEYER, are the first to rattle—the very first to rattle—if we dare go down the road of potential shutdown, if we dare go down the road of limiting the size and scope of the Federal Government. Why? Because the jurisdictions they represent are wholly and heavily dependent on this Federal Government.

I am a proud Texan dating back to the 1850s, but I grew up in Loudoun County, Virginia, and went to the University of Virginia. When I grew up in Loudoun County, it was 80 percent dirt roads. There was one stoplight in my entire school district. It was a rural county fully separated from Washington, D.C., and now it is the richest per capita county in the United States of America because leviathan grows.

□ 1015

It is because leviathan continues to separate from the real Americans out there—the people throughout the entire country who are not being represented by this body.

If we want to talk about representation, then let's talk about this body doing its job to represent the people, the forgotten man. The American people are tired of watching their country burning to the ground, statutes being toppled, people getting killed in the streets. And we are spending time here today on an unconstitutional effort to create a State out of a Federal city that the Constitution contemplated being separated so that it could be unique and be the power seat of this great country.

Mr. Speaker, that is what this is about.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland State (Mr. SARBANES), my good friend, that ceded land in perpetuity out of which the District of Columbia was formed.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, our colleague across the aisle a moment ago talked about the District of Columbia being special. There is nothing special about being second class, which is what has happened to the residents of the District. For two centuries, the people of the District of Columbia have been disenfranchised, denied fair representation, excluded from our great democratic experiment. Over 700,000 residents—who just like my constituents and your constituents—work hard, pay their taxes, and contribute every day to the betterment of our society. Yet, they do not have an equal voice in this Chamber.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to remedy this great injustice. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON should have the same opportunity that every one of our Members does: To see her name on that board for every vote, to walk into the well and cast her ''yea'' or ''nay'' on behalf of the constituents she represents.

We thank Congresswoman NORTON for her service and for her tireless fight to bring dignity to the residents of Washington, D.C.

House Democrats committed to this moment when this body passed H.R. 1 more than a year ago. We observed then and we reiterate today: There are no constitutional, historical, financial, or economic reasons why the 700,000 Americans who live in the District of Columbia should not be granted Statehood.

At a time when Americans of all political stripes are demanding a greater voice and participation in the political town square, the residents of D.C. are being forcibly kept out of the town square by this bizarre and indefensible anachronism.

Today, we are declaring enough is enough. It is time to give a voice and a vote to the residents of the District of Columbia.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on H.R. 51.

Mr. HICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, to somehow try to paint a picture that D.C. is a second-class city is absolute absurdity. Without question, this is the most influential city in this country—perhaps in the world.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN), my friend.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, first of all, a little comment, maybe clearing things up. I will point out to everyone in the room that when we say the Pledge of Allegiance, the phrase ''to the Republic for which it stands'' is in the pledge. And I think we all remember the memorable comment of Benjamin Franklin at a time around when the Constitution was drafted. He talked about he was giving us ''a Republic, if we can keep it.''

Now, at the time the Constitution was drafted, our forefathers did include a district, which would be the capital for the country. Our forefathers put together the United States and reached a compromise between the 13 States. They realized at the time it would be ridiculous to break apart a State and give it two Senators, like all of the other States. In part, that is because it is so different and has such a different interest in the States.

All of the States, the 50 States, to a variety of degree, have been given an amount of agriculture. There is virtually no agriculture—maybe no agriculture—maybe somewhere there is a greenhouse or something in the District of Columbia. There is no manufacturing. There is no mining or logging. Or if there is, it is so tiny we can barely see it.

Mr. Speaker, it is a unique city because it is based on government jobs and tourist jobs connected to people coming and visiting those government buildings. It is not like any other State out there. If it were to become a State, its representatives would have spent all their time almost devoted to getting more money for the city. And already the Federal Government puts a great deal of money into the city. You couldn't complain that they do not have enough funds for their schools or their city. I believe their schools are somewhere in the top—if you considered it a State—somewhere in the top three or four in the country, as far as funding per person.

Mr. Speaker, it would make no sense, say, for Wisconsin to break off and give two Senators to Milwaukee and give two Senators to the rest of the State. Milwaukee is not a State.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. KELLY).

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 51.

For more than 200 years, Americans living in the District of Columbia—many of whom serve the people of this great Nation as public servants—have been denied the right to self-government. That is a founding principle of our great Nation.

Mr. Speaker, today, D.C. is home to more than 700,000 Americans and, yet, they have no voting Members of Congress and no voice in the Senate.

Establishing Washington, Douglass Commonwealth would not create our Nation's smallest State by population, nor would it be reliant on the Federal Government to survive.

There are States with smaller populations and many other States that are far more dependent on Federal assistance.

Despite paying more in total Federal income tax than the residents of 22 other States, D.C. is continually treated like a territory instead of a State in funding bills. These calculations starve the local government of the funds they rightly deserve.

Mr. Speaker, I hope my colleagues listen to the voice of our Founding Fathers, who we keep hearing about. ''No taxation without representation.'' Well, D.C. pays its taxes. It deserves a voice in Congress. And let's be clear about who is playing politics.

Mr. HICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT), my good friend and a great leader.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, it is amazing to hear people that have been trained in the Constitution disregard it so. But we are taught at law school the ability to rationalize absolutely anything. But the fact is, Article I, Section 8, there is not one of the 37 States that have been brought in by Congress that is addressed in the Constitution like this district is. And it says specifically—this is the right of Congress—''To exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever, over such District (not exceeding 10 miles square)''—that is this one—''as may, by cession of particular States and the acceptance of Congress, become the seat of Government of the United States.''

And if you go back and look at Federalist Paper 43, you look at the debate at the time, they understood. We have had the capital in New York City. We have had it in Philadelphia. And that is dangerous. Because it means if you are surrounded by a State and the capital is part of that State or in the middle surrounded by the State, then pressure can be brought to bear that would be so unfair. Look at the debate. That is why that is in there, to protect that.

Mr. Speaker, now, one of the things that we agree on is that it is wrong to make the residents of the District of Columbia pay income tax. I have been filing a bill since 2008, I think it was, that would eliminate the Federal tax. None of the territories—who also don't have full voting Members of Congress—pay Federal income tax. D.C. shouldn't either. That is a legislative fix we can do.

Mr. HICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time is remaining for each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia has 9 minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from Washington, D.C. has 10 minutes remaining.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I say to the gentleman, paying Federal taxes, that says everything about the desire of citizens of Washington, D.C. to be equal, that we are quite willing to continue to pay Federal income tax.

And I appreciate his amendment. We have rejected his amendment because we want to be full citizens. That means paying our share.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Ms. PLASKETT), my good friend.

Ms. PLASKETT. Mr. Speaker, as a Member representing the territories, I would rather pay taxes than have the treatment that this body gives to those that live in the territories. I believe it is the greatest scam and an okey-doke that you have allowed us not to pay taxes and hold that against us to ask for our equal treatment. So keep paying those taxes and you will get your Statehood one day.

Mr. Speaker, the United States territories that I represent are also not on equal footing with the rest of the Nation. There is no representation in the U.S. Senate. No equal voting representation in the House of Representatives. Unlike D.C., we cannot vote for President. We know what it is like to be part of the greatest country in the world but not a full participant, and it feels incomplete.

As Americans, we strive to be productive citizens and an asset to the Nation. Statehood for D.C. is a matter of fairness that has been slow in coming. This city, built by African Americans with the use of forced labor, contributes more in Federal taxes on a per person basis than many States. It is a punishment to Americans living in the capital, including those working in policy or public service for the good of the Nation, to be disenfranchised when they establish a home in the District.

This body changed the boundaries in the 1800s to ensure that slave owners could keep their slaves. We have changed the boundaries in the committee to allow for the Federal city to still exist and the residents of D.C. to become a State. It has been done by this body before. Don't make it seem like it is something that can't happen again. At this very moment, citizens across this Nation are clamoring for change, equality, and justice. With one vote, we can deliver that for the people of D.C.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to do what is right and allow the people of this city to feel whole, to feel complete, to feel like they matter. Support H.R. 51.

Mr. HICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, it certainly can happen. It just requires a constitutional amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HARRIS), my good friend.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I hope America is watching what is going on on the floor today, and they are paying careful attention to this debate.

We hear speaker after speaker from the other side of the aisle say things like, ''It has been done before.'' The majority leader: ''Clear precedent.''

Yeah, there is clear precedent. We know the person who was in the Chair just before comes from the State that actually was the clear precedent: In

1847, when retrocession occurred. You know, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle say this isn't politics. This is about getting voting rights. This is about things like this. I would suggest that perhaps the people watching go to Wikipedia and see what the history is about the support for retrocession back to Maryland.

Mr. Speaker, because, you see, this is not Congress's land. This is Maryland's land. Maryland gave it to the United States for the sole purpose of a permanent, Federal enclave. The nerve of hundreds of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle thinking it is their land. It is Maryland's land. And if you want voting rights, it is simple: Do exactly what occurred in 1847 and give the land back to Maryland.

But, whoa, wait a minute. That is not what this debate is about, because retrocession has been proposed many times with no Democrat supporters. In fact, the majority leader was in Congress when these bills were proposed. If what he really wants is voting rights, he should have cosponsored the bill.

Mr. Speaker, you know that if retrocession occurs, every single resident—except those ones in the White House—because of the amendment to the Constitution they actually get three electoral votes under this proposed legislation, every single one of those residents would have representation in Congress. And, yes, ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON could sit in Congress representing people from the State of Maryland.

□ 1030

This is a pure political ploy. That is why none of my colleagues from Maryland are going to vote against this bill today. That is why none of my colleagues from Maryland have put in a retrocession bill. That is why all of my hundreds of colleagues across the aisle are going to pretend this is Congress' land. This is not.

The Constitution is clear. If this land is given back to Maryland, Maryland has to accept.

Well, the argument is that Maryland doesn't want it back. That is interesting. I sat in the Maryland legislature with my colleague, who is sitting across the aisle right now. If our representatives from Maryland are so concerned about getting voting rights, it is very simple. Go to their colleagues in the Maryland General Assembly, fully controlled by the Democrats, and say: ''Let's take it back. Let's give those 700,000 people voting rights.''

Mr. Speaker, that is the correct approach. Don't steal this land from Maryland.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, important to note that Maryland permanently ceded the land that now is part of the District of Columbia. You can't get back what you permanently ceded.

And it is important to note that we have had several Members from Maryland speak.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. MFUME).

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the distinguished Delegate, the congressperson from Washington, D.C., for her steadfast leadership on this.

I had the opportunity to work with her predecessor back in the late 1980s in this Chamber, Delegate Walter Fauntroy, who passed the torch, and the Delegate has done a great job.

It took 27 years to get this vote back onto the floor. I was there in 1993 when we came up short. Today, I am hoping and praying that this bill passes.

I want to congratulate you on that and to remind others that this is not going to go away because, at the end of the day, this is really about taxation without representation, one of the original 27 colonial grievances filed against the King, which was a major cause of the Revolutionary War.

So when people in Boston had the Tea Party and threw tea in the Boston Harbor in December of 1773, they were making a statement and setting an example for people across this Nation to understand that we just can't tax people without allowing them to be represented.

You have heard the great discussions, the cogent points about the fiscal side of this, that D.C. residents pay more taxes per capita than any other State, that they pay more general taxes than 22 States, that they have a budget larger than 11 States, and a bond rating better than almost 30 other States.

I have heard this discussion when it comes to fiscal matters about the constitutional federation of States, the great words of Hamilton and the Federalists and the Federalist Papers. I understand that.

But one thing we have to remember when we raise Hamilton and talk about the Federalists is that their stated belief was the Constitution was meant to evolve, that it was a living document. That is not my impression. That is the impression and the opinion of the Federalists.

If that were not true, I could not be here as a descendant of a slave without the 13th, 14th, and 15th Amendments. The distinguished woman couldn't be here. She had not the right to vote under the Federalist Papers. Alaska and Hawaii, when I was born, were not States.

Mr. HICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the Constitution can change by amendment only.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BROOKS).

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I will never vote to give Washington, D.C., separate statehood status. Washington, D.C., is a city, not a State. Its population is roughly one-seventh that of Alabama.

To add perspective, giving D.C. statehood is the equivalent of giving Jefferson County, Alabama, or the Tennessee Valley separate statehood status. That is nuts.

History is in order. The District of Columbia originally was 100 square miles, 10-miles square. Part of D.C. was in Maryland; part was in Virginia.

In 1847, the Virginia part of the District of Columbia was given back to Virginia, leaving only the Maryland portion of D.C. still in D.C.

These former D.C., now Virginia, residents gained the right to vote on U.S. Senators once Senators became elected rather than appointed.

If D.C. residents want to vote on U.S. Senators, fine. That can be done by following historical precedence and giving the residential portion of D.C. back to Maryland, keeping the Federal Government portion, the Capitol, White House, monuments, The Mall, Federal buildings, and the like in D.C.

But this option won't be offered by Democrats because they don't care one twit about D.C. residents voting on U.S. Senators. Rather, their goal is to have two more guaranteed leftwing Senators.

If offered, I will vote to return residential portions of D.C. to Maryland, thus giving D.C. citizens the power to vote on Maryland's two U.S. Senators. That option is consistent with historical precedence.

But I will never vote to give a single middling-size city the same political power as one of America's great 50 States. I will never support this sham that is motivated by crass partisan political power, not a desire to let citizens of the District of Columbia vote on U.S. Senators.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time I have remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from the District of Columbia has 5½ minutes remaining.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS), my friend and the chair of the Financial Services Committee.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support H.R. 51, the Washington, D.C. Admission Act, which would end centuries of taxation without representation and make Washington, D.C., the 51st State.

And nobody is giving back anything. Washington, D.C., is the home to more Americans than two States, and more than 46 percent of its 700,000 residents are Black.

Make no mistake, race underlies every argument against D.C. statehood, and denying its citizens equal participation and representation is a racial, democratic, and economic injustice we cannot tolerate.

It must be acknowledged that the chance to right these wrongs with today's vote would not be possible without my good friend, ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON. We were both elected at the same time, and she has been dogged and consistent every single year since then in her fight for this bill and D.C. statehood.

I am so pleased to join my friend in today's milestone vote, and I am hopeful that ELEANOR's long effort will finally give D.C. the rights they deserve.

Mr. HICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers. I am prepared to close, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD).

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I thank Delegate ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON for her years of leadership on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, from 1910 through 1970, thousands of African Americans from my district, and from your district, Mr. HICE, migrated to Washington, D.C., seeking employment and better opportunities than existed in the segregated South. They work and worship, and they pay their taxes. They own and operate businesses here in D.C. They teach in the public schools. They are Capitol Police. They clean our offices.

I know very well that some of Ms. HOLMES NORTON's ancestors originated in my congressional district.

Mr. Speaker, D.C. residents pay the highest per capita Federal income taxes in the country. They pay more Federal taxes than residents of 22 States. It is a grave injustice that they don't have representation in this body.

It is time to say to the citizens of this city that they, too, are American citizens and deserve to be part of this great Union, with full rights of citizenship.

What they don't need to hear on this floor today is for Members to say, ''I will never vote for D.C. statehood.'' That is irresponsible.

Mr. HICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON).

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, Article IV, Section 3.1, provides that new States may be admitted by Congress into this Union. There is absolutely no requirement for a constitutional amendment.

I was born and raised in Washington, D.C., spending my formative years in this great domain, and I grew up knowing that my parents paid taxes but had no voting representation in Congress.

It was paradoxical that I learned in school that the cries of patriots, ''No taxation without representation,'' did not apply to the people of this great domain.

We obeyed the same laws and paid the same taxes as our fellow Americans, but we had no hope in taking part in the governance of America.

I thank the Delegate ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON for keeping hope alive.

I am here today to say that it is time to end the legal disenfranchisement of a population larger than the States of Vermont and Wyoming. This vote is long overdue, and I intend to vote in favor of D.C. statehood, and I encourage my colleagues to vote ''yes.''

Mr. HICE of Georgia. May I inquire as to how much time I have remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. HICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. STEVENS).

Ms. STEVENS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my esteemed and tireless colleague from the District of Columbia, Congresswoman HOLMES NORTON.

In this very Chamber, we have, throughout our Nation's history, long debated statehood for many lands and many people, and adding new States we have.

In 1837, Michigan statehood was passed by Congress as the 26th State and signed by President Jackson, who proudly stated Michigan was ''admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States in all respects.''

In 1959, as we added Hawaii to the Union, the Secretary of the Interior declared: ''The great statehood of Hawaii will be granted and prove to the world . . . that we practice what we preach.''

Now, as we add Washington, D.C., and recognize the over 700,000 people, hundreds of thousands of Federal taxpaying people, to this Union, we reaffirm, we restore, and we continue to flourish our democracy that manifests to promote the general welfare.

Mr. HICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time I have remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from the District of Columbia has 1½ minutes remaining.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I want to give all acknowledgment to the outstanding gentlewoman, ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON.

President Washington said: ''The Constitution is the guide which I will never abandon.'' Nothing in the Constitution says that we cannot make the Washington State the Douglass Commonwealth. Frederick Douglass said there is no power without struggle.

The sons and daughters of Washington, D.C., laid down their lives for this country in World Wars. They stand for this country in service to this government. Why are we denying them their rights?

Alaska has 700,000-plus people. There is no population requirement. Make Washington, D.C., a State now.

Mr. Speaker, as a senior member of the Committee on the Judiciary, as an original cosponsor of the legislation, I rise in strong and enthusiastic support of H.R. 51, the ''Washington, D.C. Admission Act,'' which declares the State of Washington, Douglass Commonwealth, to be a State of the United States of America, and declares its admission into the Union on an equal footing with the other States in all respects whatsoever.

George Washington, the nation's first Chief Executive, and the President of the Constitutional Convention which met in Philadelphia, said: ''The Constitution is a guide which I will never abandon.''

The action we are taking today to admit the State of Washington, Douglass Commonwealth, as the 51st state of the Union is consistent with the authority vested in the Congress by the Constitution in Article IV, section 3, clause 1.

The Constitution does not specify a minimum population or acreage test that a state must meet to gain admission to the Union, rather leave the determination to be made in the sound judgment of the Congress, which admitted Wyoming which has more than 200,000 fewer persons than the District of Columbia, and Alaska, which had only 224,000 persons when it was admitted as a state in 1959.

Mr. Speaker, in doing passing this legislation, we remove a stain that has blighted our nation for more than 200 years.

I thank Congresswoman ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON, my colleague and the representative of the 706,000 residents of the District of Columbia, for her tireless and relentless efforts in shepherding this legislation to the floor today.

Mr. Speaker, in his famous 1857 oration in Candaigua, New York, the great abolitionist, Frederick Douglass, said: ''If there is no struggle there is no progress. Those who profess to favor freedom and yet deprecate agitation are men who want crops without plowing up the ground; they want rain without thunder and lightning. They want the ocean without the awful roar of its many waters.''

The vote we are about to cast today is long time in coming but shows that struggle can lead to progress, that truth crushed to earth shall rise again, that justice cannot be denied.

Today, we vote to end two centuries of shame and correct an injustice to the citizens of the District of Columbia.

Mr. Speaker, let us not lose sight of one indisputable and shameful fact: over 700,000 people living in the District of Columbia lack direct voting representation in the House of Representatives and Senate.

Specifically, the citizens of the District of Columbia pay more in federal taxes than 22 states and pay more in federal taxes per capita than any state.

The District of Columbia's population (705,000) is larger than the populations of Wyoming and Vermont, and seven states had populations under one million in the last census.

The District of Columbia's annual budget ($15.5 billion) is larger than the budgets of 14 states.

The District of Columbia has a higher per capita personal income and gross domestic product than any state.

District of Columbia residents have fought and died in every American war, including the Revolution itself, and almost 200,000 District residents have served in the military since World War I alone.

Approximately 30,000 veterans live in the District of Columbia, and it should be noted that during the Vietnam War, 243 District residents were casualties of war, a casualty figure greater than that observed by 10 different states.

So, Mr. Speaker, it is undisputable that residents of the District of Columbia serve in the military, pay billions of dollars in federal taxes each year, and assume other responsibilities of U.S. citizenship.

But for over 200 years, the District of Columbia has been denied voting representation

in Congress—the entity that has ultimate authority over all aspects of the city's legislative, executive, and judicial functions.

Mr. Speaker, if a person can be called upon to pay federal taxes and serve in the armed forces of the United States, then he or she should at least have the opportunity to vote for a representative who could at least cast a symbolic vote in this chamber on critical matters facing our nation.

Issues like war and peace, equality and justice.

And tear-gassing peaceful protestors in Lafayette Square exercising their First Amendment rights.

Mr. Speaker, taxation with representation is tyranny.

H.R. 51 would create a state from essentially the eight hometown wards of the District of Columbia and provides that the new state would be equal to the other 50 states in all respects, and that the residents of the State of Washington, D.C. would have all the rights of statehood, including voting representation in Congress and full local self-government.

Under the legislation this new state would have no jurisdiction over the reduced federal district, which would consist of the area that Members of Congress and visitors associate with the capital of our country: the U.S. Capitol, the U.S. Supreme Court, the White House, the principal federal monuments, and the federal buildings and grounds adjacent to the National Mall and the U.S. Capitol.

It is unconscionable that 700,000 Americans are being unconscionably denied a vote and a voice in the most important legislative body in the world.

As a supporter of freedom, democracy, and equality, I believe that it is long overdue for the citizens of the District of Columbia to have representation in the House and the Senate to advocate for their interests on vital matters coming before the Congress of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, it is wrong that we must be reminded daily by license plates in the District of Columbia that ''Taxation without representation is tyranny.''

The people in Boston felt so strongly about this in 1775 that they rebelled in Boston Harbor, launching the ''Boston Tea Party.''

The principle that political authority derives from the consent of the government is no less applicable when it comes to the District of Columbia.

Let us be clear, there is no dispute that hundreds of thousands of American citizens reside in the District of Columbia.

We all agree that universal suffrage is the hallmark of a democratic regime, of which the United States is the world's leading exemplar.

None of us believes it is fair that citizens of the District of Columbia pay federal taxes, risk life and limb fighting wars abroad to protect American democracy and extend the blessings of liberty to people living in foreign lands.

In short, there is no moral reason to deny the citizens of the District of Columbia admission as a state in the United States and the right to full representation in Congress.

The only question is whether Congress has the will and the constitutional authority to do so.

Congress has always had the constitutional authority but for much of the last 200 years, it has not had the will.

Let us change that, beginning today with our vote to pass H.R. 51, the Washington, D.C. Admission Act.

□ 1045

Mr. HICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I am intrigued listening to my colleagues waxing eloquent about the divine creation of the District of Columbia. Give me a break. It was old-fashioned horse trading between Hamilton, Madison, and Jefferson like the declaration of enslaved people being three-fifths of a person without being able to vote for themselves, just simply power for White people.

It is time to recognize the reality of what I think was a corrupt bargain and give the District of Columbia the statehood it deserves.

Mr. HICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Despite the passionate arguments that we have heard today regarding H.R. 51, the plain truth is that Washington, D.C.'s status as the Capital of the United States is exactly as our Founders intended.

To be clear, Washington, D.C., is a vibrant and special city holding a unique position in our Nation's Federal system. Our Nation's Capital does not exist within one State, and therefore, it is free from the influence of any State. That is exactly the intention of our Constitution and our Founders.

But not only is the Constitution proposal going to be a violation of our Constitution, but practically speaking, D.C. is not prepared financially and otherwise as a microstate.

Currently, Washington, D.C., only raises about half of its annual budget through local taxes, despite the fact that they have some of the highest taxes in the Nation. This shows a lack of financial readiness for the responsibility of statehood.

Congress has already dealt with this in the past, and D.C.'s financial situation, we bailed it out in the 1990s after 20 years of troubled self-rule.

The majority's bill does not take into account how these budgetary shortfalls would be remedied or how the taxpayers would be relieved. Statehood first, the details later, that is the majority's proposal.

In seeking to gain an extra two seats in the Senate, Democrats would strip this great historic city of its special status and make it a shell state. The Democrat's statehood proposal leaves us with a State in name only, and a tiny remnant of a Federal district. This is far from the intent of our Founding Fathers.

We live in a federation, a federation of States. I would say there is no one who is a greater supporter of States' rights than I am, but because I believe in States' rights, I cannot support this city becoming a State.

D.C. is simply not equipped to shoulder the burden of statehood. If Democrats were serious about granting representation to the citizens of D.C., they would consider retroceding the land back to Maryland, as has been proposed, but that has been rejected over and over. If D.C.'s citizens rejoin Maryland, they would gain the Senate and House representation that supposedly is what this bill is after.

But this statehood proposal is about politics all dressed up in noble arguments about disenfranchising and taxation without representation. It is just a big sham.

The Constitution is clear. A new State can be formed from Federal territories or from existing States with their permission. But the current Federal district is not an existing State, nor is it a territory. It is unique, and our Framers specifically crafted the Constitution with a maximum size for the District, so as to prevent it from becoming a State.

We have been over this time and again, but H.R. 51 changes the clear intentions of our Founders. By making the District a State, we are going exactly against the intent of our Framers and the intentions of our Constitution. The Framers crafted our Constitution with the direct intent that we would have a unique district, the seat of our Federal Government that is not influenced by a State. That is what we have, and that is what we need to keep.

H.R. 51 disregards the Constitution, and we cannot take this lightly. I ask my colleagues to oppose this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from the District of Columbia has 30 seconds remaining.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

This bill allows our country to live up to its claim to be a democracy. We stand out as the only democracy which denies democracy to the residents of its own Capital City.

Our claim to world leadership is marred until, with this bill, the residents of our Capital are equal in citizenship to the citizens of every Member of the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 51, the Washington, D.C. Admission Act—a bill long overdue and exceedingly necessary.

This is a measure that I have supported since my inaugural term in the House of Representatives, 27 years ago, when I cosponsored Representative HOLMES NORTON's second-ever statehood bill. Her continued leadership and tenacity on this issue as the Delegate from Washington, D.C. is nothing short of extraordinary, and it is because of her efforts that today we vote on a statehood bill for the first time in almost three decades.

For too long, the over-700,000 residents of the District of Columbia been denied voting representation while still paying taxes, serving in our military, and adhering to federal laws. Think of that—here, in the greatest legislative and deliberative body in the world, we routinely prevent hundreds of thousands of our

citizens, half of which are African American, from having their voices heard. The admission of D.C. as a state and redesignation as the Douglass Commonwealth will not only extend rights and liberties to its residents but, in doing so, honor the memory of the iconic abolitionist and D.C. native Frederick Douglass.

Mr. Speaker, as over half of the Members of the House of Representatives are already cosponsoring H.R. 51, I do not doubt that it will pass. I urge those remaining who have not cosponsored this bill to stand on the right side of history and support this bill.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of D.C. statehood. Today's affirmative vote in the House of Representatives to admit the State of Washington, Douglass Commonwealth as the 51st state in the Union is long overdue for the more than 700,000 disenfranchised American citizens who currently live in the District of Columbia. This is the first time a chamber of Congress has voted to approve D.C. statehood. I have long been a proponent of D.C. statehood and was the only member of the Virginia delegation to vote for D.C. statehood the last time it came before the House in 1993. And during my service as a member of the Virginia House of Delegates, I introduced the resolution for Virginia to ratify the Constitutional Amendment to grant full Congressional voting rights to the District of Columbia. Unfortunately, neither my resolution nor the Constitutional Amendment were ultimately successful.

Today's vote marks a historic victory for the indefatigable advocates for statehood including my colleague, Congresswoman ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON, who has been a tireless advocate for the disenfranchised citizens of our nation's capital. Supporting D.C. statehood is about our nation's core constitutional principles of self-determination, opposition to taxation without representation, and giving an equal voice to all Americans regardless of where they live. I hope my Republican colleagues in the Senate put aside politics and pass this bill and finally end the historic injustice that has persisted for more than 200 years for the people of Washington, D.C.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 51—the Washington, D.C. Admission Act—introduced by my colleague, Del. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON. This bill would not only establish the District of Columbia ("D.C.") as the 51st state of the United States, but it would also grant long overdue voting representation at the federal level to the residents of D.C.

I remain committed to the principles this country boasts: democracy and representation. Since 1801, the residents of D.C. have been denied federal representation. They pay their taxes and have fought and died in every American war, yet those armed service members and their families are deprived of the freedoms they have fought to protect. Statehood is the only remedy that provides full representation in Congress for the residents of Washington, D.C.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 1017, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the bill in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Keller moves to recommit the bill H.R. 51 to the Committee on Oversight and Reform with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendments:

Page 3, insert before line 1 the following:

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) The admission of Washington, Douglass Commonwealth as a State under this Act requires the President to issue a proclamation prior to the new State's admission to the Union.

(2) To assure the interests of the rest of the Nation that up until now have had shared ownership of the Nation's capital through their representation in Congress, this Act requires the constitution of the new State of Washington, Douglass Commonwealth to contain certain provisions before the President issues a proclamation recognizing it as a new State in the Union.

(3) This Act provides as a precondition of admission that the new State require in its State constitution that the State does not require a fee or assessment in order to carry a concealed firearm in the state.

(4) This Act provides as a precondition of admission that the new State prohibit in its State constitution any statute, ordinance, policy or practice that prohibits or restricts any government entity or official from enforcing national immigration laws.

(5) This Act provides as a precondition of admission that the new State prohibit in its State constitution, in order to protect the history and integrity of so many of the Nation's monuments and landmarks that will exist within the boundaries of the new state of Washington, Douglass Commonwealth, any law that alters or affects any of the authorities of Federal planning commissions.

(6) This Act provides as a precondition of admission that the new State require in its State constitution that the State enact and enforce laws to prohibit the destruction of any property of the United States within the State and laws to prohibit the destruction of any military memorials within the State.

(7) This Act provides as a precondition of admission that the new State require in its State constitution that the State enact and enforce laws to prohibit secession from the State or the obstruction of law enforcement officers.

(8) This Act provides as a precondition of admission that the new State prohibit in its State constitution any use of State taxpayer funds for campaign activity for public office.

(9) This Act provides as a precondition of admission that—

(A) the new State require in its State constitution that the new State ensures dedicated and priority funding for law enforcement and public safety; and

(B) the Mayor provides a certification to the President that the District of Columbia has enacted laws providing for adequate and permanent funding of law enforcement and public safety.

(10) This Act provides as a precondition of admission that the new State require in the State constitution that the State will continue to participate in the Scholarships for Opportunity and Results program under the terms and conditions in effect as of the date of admission.

Page 6, line 18, strike ''The President'' and insert ''Subject to subsections (c) and (d), the President''.

Page 7, insert after line 2 the following:

(c) REVISIONS TO STATE CONSTITUTION.—The President may not issue the proclamation under subsection (a) until the Mayor provides the President with a written certification that the District of Columbia has adopted each of the following amendments to the State Constitution:

(1) RIGHT TO CONCEALED CARRY.—An amendment that prohibits the State from requiring a fee or assessment in order to carry a concealed firearm in the State.

(2) SANCTUARY CITY STATUS.—An amendment that prohibits the State from having in effect a statute, ordinance, policy, or practice that prohibits or restricts any government entity or official from—

(A) sending, receiving, maintaining, or exchanging with any Federal, State, or local government entity information regarding the citizenship or immigration status (lawful or unlawful) of any individual; or

(B) complying with a request lawfully made by the Department of Homeland Security under section 236 or 287 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1226 and 1357) to comply with a detainer for, or notify about the release of, an individual.

(3) AUTHORITIES OF FEDERAL PLANNING COMMISSIONS.—An amendment prohibiting the laws of the State or members of executive offices of the State from acting to alter or affect any of the authorities of Federal planning commissions, including the National Capital Planning Commission, the Commission of Fine Arts, or the National Capital Memorial Advisory Commission, as such authorities are amended by section 324 of this Act.

(4) PROHIBITING DESTRUCTION OF FEDERAL PROPERTY AND MILITARY MEMORIALS.—An amendment requiring the State to enact and enforce laws to prohibit the destruction or the attempted destruction of any property of the United States within the State and laws to prohibit the destruction or the attempted destruction of any structure, plaque, statue, or other monument on public property within the State commemorating the service of any person or persons in the armed forces of the United States.

(5) PROHIBITING SECESSION FROM STATE OR OBSTRUCTING LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS.—An amendment requiring the State—

(A) to enact and enforce laws to subject any person who incites, sets on foot, assists, or engages in any rebellion, secession attempt or claim, or insurrection against the authority of the State or the laws thereof, or gives aid or comfort thereto, to a fine or a term of imprisonment of not less than 10 years, or both, and to prohibit any such person from holding any public office in the State; and

(B) to enact and enforce laws to make it a felony to obstruct a law enforcement officer, and to provide that a person commits such a felony if the person willfully hinders, delays, or obstructs any law enforcement officer in the discharge of his or her official powers or duties.

(6) PROHIBITING USE OF TAXPAYER FUNDING FOR POLITICAL CAMPAIGNS.—An amendment requiring the State to enact and enforce laws that prohibit any revenue collected (or otherwise generated or procured) by the State from being used to finance, directly or indirectly, any candidate, or candidate committee supporting a campaign, for election for public office.

(7) REQUIRING DEDICATED AND PRIORITY FUNDING FOR LAW ENFORCEMENT AND PUBLIC SAFETY.—To protect the life, property, and

welfare of the citizens of the State and visitors from other jurisdictions by ensuring the adequate and continued funding of law enforcement and public safety agencies—

(A) an amendment requiring the State Chief Financial Officer, or the equivalent State official, to appropriately prioritize law enforcement and public safety in the State budget and in the administration of the State's cash management and payroll operations; and

(B) an amendment prioritizing access to the State budget emergency and contingency reserve funds, or their equivalents, to assure uninterrupted spending to cover the operational expenses related to law enforcement and public safety.

(8) PARTICIPATION IN OPPORTUNITY SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM.—An amendment requiring the State to continue to participate in the Scholarships for Opportunity and Results program under the terms and conditions in effect as of the date of admission.

(d) BUDGET CERTIFICATION FOR FUNDING OF LAW ENFORCEMENT AND PUBLIC SAFETY.—The President may not issue the proclamation under subsection (a) until the Mayor provides the President with a written certification that the District of Columbia has enacted laws sufficient to provide for a dedicated source of locally-raised revenue to provide adequate and permanent funding for law enforcement and public safety agencies to enforce the laws of the State and protect the life, property, and welfare of the citizens of the State and visitors from other jurisdictions.

Page 85, line 10, strike ''shall apply as follows:'' and all that follows through line 24 and insert ''shall apply with respect to the State of Washington, Douglass Commonwealth and the Capital in the same manner and to the same extent as such chapter applied with respect to the District of Columbia as of the day before the date of the admission of the State into the Union''.

Page 86, line 6, strike ''four citizens'' and insert ''five citizens''.

Page 86, line 11, strike ''four citizen members'' and insert ''five citizen members''.

Page 87, line 2, strike ''means the'' and insert ''means the State of Washington, Douglass Commonwealth, the''.

Page 87, line 10, strike ''and the State of Washington, Douglass Commonwealth''.

Page 87, line 13, strike ''LIMITING APPLICATION TO THE CAPITAL'' and insert ''CLARIFYING APPLICATION TO THE NATIONAL CAPITAL''.

Page 87, line 20, strike ''the term 'Capital' means'' and insert ''the term 'National Capital' means''.

Page 88, line 3, strike ''Capital'' and insert ''National Capital''.

Page 88, line 5, strike ''LIMITING APPLICATION TO CAPITAL'' and insert ''CLARIFYING APPLICATION TO NATIONAL CAPITAL''.

Page 88, line 9, strike ''LIMITING APPLICATION TO CAPITAL'' and insert ''CLARIFYING APPLICATION TO NATIONAL CAPITAL''.

Page 88, line 14, strike ''CAPITAL'' and insert ''NATIONAL CAPITAL''. In the matter proposed to be amended by paragraph (2) of section 324(c), insert ''National'' before ''Capital'' each place it appears in the heading and the text of the new paragraph (2) of section 8902(a) of title 40, United States Code.

Page 88, line 15, strike ''Capital'' and insert ''National Capital''.

Page 89, line 6, strike ''Capital'' and insert ''National Capital''.

Page 89, line 12, strike ''Capital'' and insert ''National Capital''.

Page 89, line 23, strike ''urban fabric of'' and insert ''urban fabric of the State of Washington, Douglass Commonwealth, and the''.

Mr. KELLER (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to talk about how for over 200 years lawmakers have come from every State in the Union to work and live in this District.

The city was not meant to be a prize of conquest like the ancient walled cities of Europe. It was not meant to be the hub of trade like the early American cities. Above anything, it was meant to represent a center of the federation created by our Constitution.

The city is tied to the idea of the American Republic, a living piece of collaboration, the star on the map representing the 50 stars on the flag.

With the creation of a 51st State of Washington, Douglass Commonwealth, a State the size of a small county, that collaboration will be gone. The majority believes it is a small price to pay for two Senators.

Republicans need assurances that the interests of our constituents will be reflected in this new State that will have undue influence over the Nation's Federal Government.

So, my motion contains reasonable additions to H.R. 51 that will require the President to ensure certain amendments to the State constitution are incorporated before granting statehood. These provisions reflect the entirety of the Nation's views, not just those of cities controlled by Democrats.

There is provision that prohibits the former capital from being a sanctuary city. These are provisions that prohibit taxpayer funds being used for political campaigns. These are provisions to protect Americans' Second Amendment rights. These are provisions that provide full funding for law enforcement, that prohibit the destruction of our national monuments, that prohibit the creation of so-called autonomous zones.

Since early entry of new States into the Union, Congress has required that constitutions of the new States reflect certain considerations before granting admission. Nevada and West Virginia were required to prohibit slavery. Various Western States were required to prohibit polygamy.

These requests do not violate the Supreme Court's equal footing doctrine, but the idea of the State of Washington, Douglass Commonwealth containing wholly within it the entirety of the Federal Capital does, in fact, violate this doctrine.

A State with a controlling influence over the Nation's Federal Government and Capital is simply not on equal footing with the other 50 States. It is above them.

A vote for the majority's design for D.C. statehood is a vote for D.C.'s superiority. The Founders recognized the status of Washington, D.C. House Republicans do not support deviation from their vision.

However, if the Democrats insist on creating this new State, it is only fair that it be established as a State with policy values that more closely reflect the rest of the country.

I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this motion to recommit, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I claim the time in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maryland is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to reject this weak and unconstitutional motion to recommit.

The motion proposes to condition the admission of Washington, Douglass Commonwealth on either the imposition of the whimsical policy preferences of the minority or simply banal restatements that the State will follow Federal law, which, obviously, it must do already under the Supremacy Clause of the Constitution. All of the States must.

But the paradigm example here, and the thing that really appears to be really on their mind, and I am glad we at least have boiled it down to this issue, is they want to make sure that the new State doesn't come in without an amendment written by the people of Washington, D.C., saying that they will not charge people a fee for carrying a concealed weapon.

Now, that is not in the U.S. Constitution, and it is not a matter of Federal law obligating the 50 States to do it, so you cannot selectively impose that on the new State of Washington, D.C. That is the equal footing doctrine, which the Supreme Court has emphasized repeatedly throughout our history, that every new State that we have granted admission to since the original 13, all 37 have entered on the exact same plane of political and constitutional equality as the original 13.

So, they want to impose their various policy preferences on different things, like concealed carry weapons and so on.

If you want to do that, then try to pass it for the entire country, and it would apply within the new State, as well. I don't think you can do it constitutionally, but that is a separate matter. Or, resign your seat from wherever you happen to be from. If you are from Georgia, resign your seat in Georgia, move to the new State, and then campaign as a Member of Congress from here or campaign for Governor or State legislator in the new State and get them to change their law because that is a matter of local policy.

I would think that the great champions of federalism and State rights would want to allow every State to make a decision for itself.

Mr. Speaker, a number of things have been said that need to be corrected.

For one thing, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROY) said that we should legislate for the real Americans, and he is going to speak for the real Americans, not the people who live in Washington. I would hope he would reflect on that and issue an apology to the people of Washington, D.C.

But it seemed that the logic of the argument was that the only people who live here are Federal employees, and they are different from the rest of America.

Now, think about that for a second. In the first place, the overwhelming majority of Federal employees do not live in Washington, D.C. As far as I could tell, less than 8 percent of Federal employees live in Washington, D.C., which means 92 percent of them live in our States in the rest of America.

Should those people be disenfranchised? Should people who work for the post office lose their right to representation in Congress? Should members of the Armed Forces be disenfranchised? The Supreme Court already said no in Carrington v. Rash. Check it out.

So, the overwhelming majority of Federal employees don't live in D.C., and the overwhelming majority of people who live in Washington, D.C., and are the constituents of Representative NORTON are not Federal employees. They do other things.

Yes, they are real Americans, too. They are bus drivers. They are schoolteachers. They are businesspeople and entrepreneurs. I mean, come on, get real, be serious, get out and meet the people in Washington.

The gentleman from Georgia said Washington, D.C., was set aside in the Constitution as a Federal district, and that was echoed by the former judge from Texas. But here, our friends just advertised their unfamiliarity both with the Constitution and with American history.

The Constitution does not fix the geographic site of the so-called seat of government, the district that is set aside for the seat of government. That is why after the Constitution was adopted, the capital was in New York for a while. It was in Philadelphia for a while. Before that, it was in Trenton, New Jersey. It was in Princeton. It was in Annapolis. We have a whole room in Annapolis set aside for where Congress met.

So the idea that you can look up the Constitution and see the boundaries or the map of Washington, D.C., is just absurd.

Now, does Congress have the authority to modify the boundaries of the Federal district as proposed by Ms. NORTON? Of course it does. We voted to do that in 1846 at the behest of a couple hundred slaveholders in Virginia who were afraid that this Congress would follow the advice of Representative Lincoln from Illinois, who said abolish the slave traffic in Washington, D.C.

□ 1100

And they were afraid it was going to happen, so Alexandria, Arlington, and Fairfax county were given back to Virginia, and it was perfectly constitutional. And there is no legal authority to the contrary in any way.

If we can modify the boundaries of the Federal District to placate a couple hundred slave masters from the 19th century, we can modify the boundaries of the Federal District to grant statehood and political equality for the people of Washington, D.C.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3 of House Resolution 965, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. MURPHY of Florida). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The House will resume proceedings on postponed questions at a later time.

NATIONAL PULSE MEMORIAL

Mr. SOTO. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3094) to designate the National Pulse Memorial located at 1912 South Orange Avenue, Orlando, Florida, 32806, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3094

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. DESIGNATION OF NATIONAL PULSE MEMORIAL.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Pulse Memorial located at 1912 South Orange Avenue, Orlando, Florida, 32806, is designated as the ''National Pulse Memorial''.

(b) EFFECT OF DESIGNATION.—The national memorial designated by this section is not a unit of the National Park System and the designation of the National Pulse Memorial shall not require or permit Federal funds to be expended for any purpose related to that national memorial.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SOTO) and the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SOTO. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the measure under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. SOTO. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, on June 12, 2016, a gunman shot and killed 49 people and injured 53 others in the Pulse nightclub shooting in Orlando, Florida. It was the single deadliest known violent attack on the LGBTQ community, the deadliest violent attack in America at that time, and an attack on our Latino community, our African-American communities, and so many others.

After this tragedy, our city came together. Doctors, first responders, and friends rushed to save the wounded; others donated funds, supplies, even their blood. Countless works of art, gifts, and letters were left at impromptu memorial sites paying tribute to the victims and survivors.

We came together in candlelight vigils across the globe to grieve and remember. We became truly Orlando Strong in the face of adversity for the whole world to see.

As we continue to honor 49 angels, we remind the world that love will always conquer hate in the end. The designation of the Pulse nightclub as a national memorial honors the lives taken, as well as the survivors, first responders, and an entire central Florida community. Together, we will open minds and hearts and make the Pulse Memorial a national symbol of hope, love, and change.

I thank my Orlando area colleagues, Congresswoman VAL DEMINGS and Congresswoman STEPHANIE MURPHY, for joining me in leading this important bipartisan legislation.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3094, offered by our colleague from Florida (Mr. SOTO).

A little over 4 years ago, on June 12, 2016, the Pulse nightclub in Orlando, Florida, became the scene of the worst terrorist attack on American soil since September 11, 2001.

Forty-nine Americans died and 53 were injured that terrible night at the hands of an ISIS-inspired coward who turned on the very country where his parents had sought refuge from the violence in Afghanistan. Instead of gratitude, he unleashed hatred and violence upon this country that had sheltered his family and made it possible for him to be born into a land of freedom and opportunity.

The poisonous political ideology that infected and animated him in his attack—and to which he pledged allegiance just before the attack—is a familiar nemesis to the founding principles of our country.

This craven and wanton attack reminds us of the threats of Islamic extremism both at home and abroad: that they are real, that they are malignant, and that they are deadly.

In the aftermath of this terrible attack on the patrons of the Pulse nightclub, its owner established a nonprofit called the onePULSE Foundation to memorialize those who died in this mass murder, known simply as ''the 49.'' The foundation worked quickly to establish a memorial in Orlando, but recently began working with Orlando's mayor to launch a design competition for a permanent memorial and museum slated to open in 2022.

This bill would redesignate the Pulse Memorial in Orlando as the National Pulse Memorial. The bill makes clear that this memorial will not be a unit of the national park system, and a designation as a national memorial does not require any Federal funds to be expended.

The House's action on this bill today complements the United States Senate's resolution passed on June 11 of this year honoring the victims of this outrage, as well as the State of Florida's designation of June 12 as Pulse Remembrance Day.

I urge adoption of the measure, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SOTO. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California and our friends across the aisle for their support.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. DEMINGS).

Mrs. DEMINGS. Madam Speaker, it is time to make the Pulse nightclub a national memorial, and the reason is that what Pulse symbolizes is relevant to all Americans.

Let me say this: Orlando does not need Congress in order to honor the 49 victims, nor the 53 who were wounded that night. We have honored them and will continue to do so for as long as their memories live on.

But it is still the right thing to do, that Congress take this action today, because, by making Pulse a national memorial, we honor not only the victims, but what they stood for, what they represent, and what our country could be and should be.

Pulse is in my district. It was a sanctuary. It was a place where Orlando's LGBTQ residents could find safety and friendship. The people there that night were not in the wrong place at the wrong time. They were exactly where they were supposed to be, among friends and loved ones, taking joy together in what my bishop referred to as a late night fellowship.

Isn't that worth celebrating? Isn't that worth protecting for every American? Could there be any right more basic?

And that is why we are here: to honor and remember them.

We will continue to grieve for those we lost and to help those who survived. We will continue together and remember.

We will continue to act on gun violence and civil rights, for the survivors of Pulse have called upon us to honor those we lost with action, not just words.

Today, with this vote, we state that Pulse was a national tragedy not only for what it was, but for what it meant; and it will be a national memorial not just to commemorate our past, but to guide our future.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Madam Speaker, I have no further speakers on our side, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SOTO. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

Mr. CICILLINE. Madam Speaker, I thank you, who brought me to the site of this horrible tragedy and allowed me to see the warmth and beauty of your community in response to it.

Four years ago, 49 people were murdered in a violent, hate-filled mass shooting at a gay nightclub in Orlando. In the days that followed, we saw and heard stories of courage, bravery, and resolve. But mostly, there was unspeakable pain for those who lost someone in this attack. And although I pray that the passage of 4 years has brought some measure of relief, the truth is that their pain will never fully go away.

It is critical that we designate this memorial today so that our country never forgets those who are lost, but it is also important to take action so this never happens again.

Individuals convicted of hate crimes should never own a gun, and that is why I introduced the Disarm Hate Act—to do just that. If you commit a hate crime, you shouldn't be allowed to own a gun, period. We know that those who commit hate crimes become increasingly violent as time goes on.

□ 1115

No American family should have to suffer because of this loophole. Let's disarm hate once and for all.

We will never forget the 49 young people who lost their lives at the Pulse club in Orlando, the extraordinary response of the first responders, and the hospital facilities that provided miraculous care that prevented so many other lives from being lost.

Let's do all that we can to prevent the next hate-filled tragedy.

Again, I salute Orlando Strong for the magnificent and nurturing response of the entire community to this devastating attack on all of us.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SOTO. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ).

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Speaker, I take this opportunity to commend Congressman SOTO, Congresswoman DEMINGS, and the gentlewoman from Florida (Congresswoman MURPHY), who is in the Chair, on this incredibly important legislation.

I traveled to attend a memorial service in the aftermath of the tragedy at Orlando's Pulse gay nightclub to mourn with the stunned community how the confluence of bigotry and weapons of war conspired to steal 49 innocent lives.

I remember the feeling of numbness and agony. It was so hard to grasp that in 2016, visitors to Pulse that night suffered a violence that far too often plagues LGBTQ-plus communities and communities of color, but this time on a mass scale. They were targeted for who they were.

Out for the evening, they assumed it was safe to be themselves, to live their truths, and yet their precious lives were snuffed out.

But in this darkest of moments, Floridians opened their arms to embrace and heal one another. They vocally denounced bigotry, whether it was aimed at our LGBTQ-plus or Hispanic communities, or too often both. They would not stay silent.

Even public figures who were not always clear LGBTQ-plus allies stood up and made a commitment to equality.

It was an encouraging moment of solidarity amidst such tragedy. Most Floridians responded by drawing closer than ever before.

Two years later, my community endured similar heartache and anger when 17 students and educators were killed at Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School. Days after that horrific school shooting, I was in Orlando and visited Pulse, where spontaneous messages of love and sadness were left behind.

As I added my message to the thousands hanging on banners there, I saw Pulse was not simply a site of tragedy and pain. It was a hallowed place to remember and honor all the individuals who were lost. But it was also now a public space affirming that equality, justice, and love are worth rallying to and fighting for.

Making Pulse a national memorial would, most importantly, properly honor those we lost way too soon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. SOTO. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ).

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Speaker, but it would also elevate that site so that millions of Americans might turn our collective pain into collective action.

In passing this bill, I hope visitors the world over will be inspired by a community that emphatically declared that love and hope will always triumph over prejudice and violence.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SOTO. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL).

Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL. Madam Speaker, I am proud to rise in support of H.R. 3094, a bill to designate the National Pulse Memorial.

On June 12, 2016, a shooter hatefully took the lives of 49 people at the Pulse nightclub in Orlando, Florida. Those who died were sons and daughters, brothers and sisters, mothers, fathers, and loving members of Florida's communities.

This tragedy brought grief and pain to all parts of the Nation, to Florida, including my very own district, and to the LGBT community.

That evening at the nightclub was Jerry Wright. His parents, MJ and Fred, are part of our community in south Florida. They described Jerry as a wonderful, loving, and caring son. He was there that evening, like any other evening, enjoying Latin music with friends, and from 1 minute to the next, his life was cruelly taken from him. He was only 31 years old.

We all know that Jerry did not deserve this. His parents and family did not deserve this.

I am very close friends now with the Wright family, and I know firsthand the anguish and the pain that they go through every single day, Mother's Day, Father's Day. That pain never goes away.

I know that personally, Madam Speaker, because I have also lost a loved one tragically to gun violence. So the pain that the families and the friends of 48 other people who lost their lives the same way is still present today.

Just over 4 years later, now it is time that we designate the Pulse nightclub as a national memorial.

This memorial will honor the memory of those who died that evening. It will ensure that loved family members like Jerry Wright are never forgotten. It will reflect on the pain that their families are still suffering. But most importantly, it will serve as a reminder that we as a country have to stop this violence and disarm hate.

This memorial is a testament to those who died, and it is a mandate that we do more to stop it from happening again.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SOTO. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. MURPHY), my neighbor in central Florida.

Mrs. MURPHY of Florida. Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding to me.

Four long years have passed since a gunman walked into my community and took the lives of 49 innocent people at the Pulse nightclub.

At that time, the events marked the largest mass shooting in this country, and to this day, it remains one of the largest incidents of a hate crime in our history.

Most of the victims were members of our LGBTQ community in Orlando, a community that created Pulse to be a safe place to be themselves, a place where hate and violence could not reach them.

It took one lone gunman to shatter that reality. But it is up to us on this day, 4 years later, to take it back.

We owe it to those we lost to honor their memories by dedicating a national memorial at Pulse, a memorial that reflects the same love, acceptance, and spirit of community that embodied the victims and that embodies the LGBTQ community at large, a place of healing for the survivors and all those affected, a welcoming place for all those seeking inspiration to act, to create a better, safer, and more inclusive Nation.

By taking this important step, America is telling the world that we will never let hate win, that we won't forget the victims, and that we will fight to ensure no community will ever go through something like this again.

God bless the Pulse victims and their families.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Madam Speaker, I would inquire if the gentleman is ready to close.

Mr. SOTO. Madam Speaker, I have three more speakers.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SOTO. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO).

Mr. TAKANO. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Four years ago, during Pride Month, our country awoke to the devastating news about a shooting at a nightclub in Orlando, Florida. The Pulse nightclub, a safe haven for the LGBTQ-plus community in Orlando was the target of an act of hate.

Forty-nine lives were taken and 53 were wounded after a gunman opened fire. The victims and survivors were LGBTQ-plus and members of the Latinx community.

This shooting was one of the deadliest attacks on LGBTQ-plus Americans in our history, and it left our community hurting, fearful, and skeptical about the progress our Nation had made towards acceptance, understanding, and belonging for LGBTQ-plus people.

Four years later, we are still grieving, we are still healing, and we are still demanding action to make equality the law of the land and to end gun violence in America.

When I visited Orlando to pay my respects to the victims and to honor their memories, what I saw at Pulse during such a painful time gave me hope. I saw a community that had come together to condemn hate, to reject intolerance, and to celebrate the lives of every single soul that was lost that night.

Our community's pride and the bravery we exhibit when we choose to embrace our identity, even in the face of hate and homophobia, is proof of how resilient we are.

Designating Pulse as a national memorial would honor the lives of those lost and it would forever stand as a symbol of pride, hope, and courage, which will always triumph over hate.

Madam Speaker, as the co-chair of the LGBT Equality Caucus, I thank Representative SOTO for his leadership, also Representative MURPHY and Representative DEMINGS.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on H.R. 3094.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SOTO. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. CLARK), the vice chair of our caucus.

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Madam Speaker, almost 4 years ago today, I joined with my colleagues and my friend, Congressman JOHN LEWIS, in leading a sit-in on this very floor after the Pulse nightclub shooting in Orlando, Florida.

We could not stand for another moment of silence. We could not stand for another day of inaction. We could not stand for another mass shooting in America.

We sat in protest. The House Democrats stopped the work of Congress because Congress had stopped working for the American people.

Now, 4 years later, our commitment to ending gun violence and hate remains absolute.

Making the Pulse nightclub a national memorial will honor the 49 lives lost in Orlando and will declare that love is love.

Today, during Pride Month, we celebrate these lives and we honor them, but we can't stop there. We need commonsense gun violence prevention measures now.

Within weeks of taking the majority, House Democrats passed two bipartisan gun safety bills. To this day, they remain stalled in the Senate.

COVID–19 is not the only public health crisis in this country. We lose 40,000 Americans a year to gun violence.

We cannot waste another day. We ask the Republicans in the Senate to pass our legislation, end this sickening cycle of gun violence in our country.

Choose love, choose peace, recognize that gun violence is often the lethal partner of racism and bigotry.

With this national memorial, we will have a physical manifestation of our commitment to end gun violence and to have equality for all.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SOTO. Madam Speaker, I would inquire how much time we have remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. MURPHY of Florida). The gentleman from Florida has 4½ minutes remaining.

Mr. SOTO. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

□ 1130

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, this is a somber moment, and I thank the gentleman from Florida for not only his passion but his recognition that America should never forget.

I thank the Speaker pro tempore for letting us remember all the faces and

families and loved ones that were impacted. Forty-nine lives, I believe, were taken in one moment, with an act of violence by a crazed gunman, with a gun.

We have been trying to stand in the gap, with background checks passed the very first moment under the leadership of Speaker PELOSI, gun violence legislation that has no impact on the Second Amendment but seeks to derail the kind of crazed gunman that was able to take these lives before first responders could come.

I remember hearing the stories of families waiting outside of the Pulse nightclub, saying they heard from their loved one but had not seen them because they were making their last-minute cries for help.

This memorial would say to America that we are not a nation of bigots, of xenophobia, racism, hatred. We are a nation of respect and dignity.

I know the families of those who died at the Pulse nightclub are still in pain and will never forget.

But it is the duty of the United States Congress, with our voices raised, to say that the book that I have been holding on to over the last 2 days, to fight for justice in policing, to talk about D.C. statehood, this book, this Constitution, which George Washington said he would use as a guide, that he would never abandon, everyone has the right to decency and life and due process.

I enthusiastically support this legislation to give dignity to the lives, and for America never to forget those lives, at the Pulse nightclub.

Madam Speaker, as a senior member of the House of Representatives, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3094, "To designate the National Pulse Memorial located at 1912 South Orange Avenue, Orlando, Florida, 32806, and for other purposes."

I am voting for H.R. 3094 because it not only memorializes and honors the 49 people who tragically lost their lives from this horrific act of violence, but it also stands as a symbol to the LGBTQ+ community, to our Latino community, to our nation, and to the world, that we will not stand for or tolerate acts of hatred against marginalized persons.

Madam Speaker, you will remember that the Pulse nightclub shooting took place on June 12th, 2016 in Orlando, Florida when a gunman shot and killed 49 people and injured 53 others.

It was the single deadliest known violent attack on both the LGBTQ+ community and our Latino community.

The Pulse nightclub was a haven for the LGBTQ community to live, love, and dance.

They came for music, celebration and fellowship.

Over four dozen would leave the Pulse Nightclub with their names added to a list of fatal victims of gun violence .

In the aftermath, we saw communities come together and support one another.

We saw doctors, first responders, and friends rush to save the wounded.

Others donated funds, supplies, and even their blood.

There were countless murals and other artworks, gifts, and letters left at impromptu memorial sites, paying tribute to the victims and survivors.

Our nation refused to let hate win.

We came together in the form of thousands of candlelight vigils to grieve, remember, and heal.

By passing H.R. 3094 today, we seek to create a permanent reminder that this act of violence and other heinous instances of bigotry are not emblematic of America or its true values.

It will also remind us that it is our duty as a society to be better and do better in terms of standing up against hate in all its forms.

I ask all members to join me in voting for H.R. 3094, "To designate the National Pulse Memorial located at 1912 South Orange Avenue, Orlando, Florida, 32806, and for other purposes."

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SOTO. Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD a list of the names of the 49 victims we lost in the Pulse nightclub shooting.

Stanley Almodovar III, 23 years old; Amanda L. Alvear, 25 years old; Oscar A. Aracena Montero, 26 years old; Rodolfo Ayala Ayala, 33 years old; Antonio Davon Brown, 29 years old; Darryl Roman Burt II, 29 years old; Angel Candelario-Padro, 28 years old; Juan Chavez Martinez, 25 years old; Luis Daniel Conde, 39 years old; Cory James Connell, 21 years old; Tevin Eugene Crosby, 25 years old; Deonka Deidra Drayton, 32 years old; Simón Adrian Carrillo Fernández, 31 years old; Leroy Valentin Fernandez, 25 years old; Mercedez Marisol Flores, 26 years old; Peter Ommy Gonzalez Cruz, 22 years old; Juan Ramon Guerrero, 22 years old; Paul Terrell Henry, 41 years old; Frank Hernandez, 27 years old; Miguel Angel Honorato, 30 years old.

Javier Jorge Reyes, 40 years old; Jason Benjamin Josaphat, 19 years old; Eddie Jamoldroy Justice, 30 years old; Anthony Luis Laureano Disla, 25 years old; Christopher Andrew Leinonen, 32 years old; Alejandro Barrios Martinez, 21 years old; Brenda Marquez McCool, 49 years old; Gilberto R. Silva Menendez, 25 years old; Kimberly Jean Morris, 37 years old; Akyra Monet Murray, 18 years old; Luis Omar Ocasio Capo, 20 years old; Geraldo A. Ortiz Jimenez, 25 years old; Eric Ivan Ortiz-Rivera, 36 years old; Joel Rayon Paniagua, 32 years old; Jean Carlos Mendez Perez, 35 years old; Enrique L. Rios, Jr., 25 years old; Jean Carlos Nieves Rodríguez, 27 years old; Xavier Emmanuel Serrano-Rosado, 35 years old; Christopher Joseph Sanfeliz, 24 years old; Yilmary Rodríguez Solivan, 24 years old; Edward Sotomayor Jr., 34 years old; Shane Evan Tomlinson, 33 years old; Martin Benitez Torres, 33 years old; Jonathan A. Camuy Vega, 24 years old; Juan Pablo Rivera Velázquez, 37 years old; Luis Sergio Vielma, 22 years old; Franky Jimmy DeJesus Velázquez, 50 years old; Luis Daniel Wilson-Leon, 37 years old; Jerald Arthur Wright, 31 years old.

Mr. SOTO. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Ms. PELOSI. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank you and him for making this important memorial possible for us today.

I rise to solemnly join my colleagues to honor the 49 beautiful souls murdered 4 years ago in an unfathomable act of hatred and bloodshed at the Pulse nightclub in Orlando.

I thank Congressman DARREN SOTO for giving us this opportunity of observing and for being a voice for peace and healing for all of those affected.

Pulse was a peaceful haven where young LGBTQ Americans could enjoy music, dancing, and celebration, knowing they were in a sanctuary of safety and solidarity.

Pulse was a monument to joy, a tribute to resilience and pride born out of the grief that Barbara Poma experienced after losing her brother, John, to AIDS. That was her motivation for starting that.

May the grief that we experience now at the loss of 49 who were murdered move us to turn our pain into purpose. This poster is all of them.

But some time after the terrible tragedy, we stood on the steps of the Capitol, holding their individual pictures. At that time, we said: We will never forget.

Thank you for giving us the opportunity to keep that promise to turn pain into purpose.

Shortly after the horrific act of hatred at Pulse, I had the solemn privilege of traveling to Orlando and meeting with survivors and families who had lost loved ones. Their message to the Congress, to a person that I met with there, was: Please, do something to stop gun violence.

Yet, painfully, since that tragic night, the horror that we saw in Orlando has been replicated in countless other communities across the country. In too many places, the epidemic of gun violence has killed too many innocent people and left too many families suffering unimaginable pain and loss.

As one of the first actions of our majority last year, the House took action to end the bloodshed by passing H.R. 8 and H.R. 1112, H.R. 8 so designated because it had been 8 years since the assault on the life of our colleague Gabby Giffords.

She survived. She is doing remarkable things, in terms of trying to end gun violence. But other people died. Hence, H.R. 8, as it was 8 years since. Then, H.R. 1112 was Mr. CLYBURN's legislation to address what happened in South Carolina.

485 days, nearly 500 days, later, we continue to urge the Senate to take up this legislation, supported broadly, Democrats, independents, Republicans, gun owners, hunters, many of whom have had to pass background checks in order to have their guns and to enjoy their sport and protect themselves. They are not against background checks. Across the country, this has broad support, nonpartisan support.

Yet, in the Congress of the United States, there is resistance to that safety of simply commonsense background checks. It isn't as if we were starting something new. This is just an expansion of the background checks that already exist to include gun shows and online sales, et cetera, just an expansion.

I remind my colleagues that an average of 100 people die every day from gun violence. Let me restate, it has been almost 500 days since the House passed those bills and the Senate has failed to take it up—almost 500 times 100 a day.

We see the consequences. Not that all of them would have been saved, but some, many, would have. Many have been saved since the original background check legislation passed.

Four years later, 4 years after Pulse, our grief remains raw. But our resolve to end the deadly scourge of gun violence and hatred—discrimination, that it was about, too—remains unwavering.

Strengthened by the memories of those who were lost to gun violence—49 souls here, and so many others—inspired by the spirit of hope that we celebrate during Pride Month, especially this weekend, let us never relent in our mission to end the horror of gun violence once and for all and end discrimination against anyone in our community.

Madam Speaker, I thank and commend Mr. SOTO, and I urge a ''yes'' vote.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I again want to commend Mr. SOTO on this bill.

In closing, it is important to note that the attack that we remember with this legislation was directed against all Americans, not just the patrons of the nightclub that night. The killer made this abundantly and chillingly clear. He declared himself an ''Islamic soldier'' and declared his allegiance and obedience to the terrorist leader, Abu Bakr al-Baghdadi. This was an attack motivated by hate, hatred against our country, hatred against all that our country stands for.

I think we can take some solace in knowing that Americans today retain their right to defend themselves against such attacks, that such terrorist attacks like this should remind us how important our Second Amendment rights remain today.

We can also take solace from the fact that al-Baghdadi, the inspiration for this terrorist attack, was hunted down and brought to justice in October last year by American Delta Force commandos, as he shielded himself with children, who he killed when he detonated a suicide vest rather than to be taken prisoner.

Madam Speaker, in memory of the 49 Americans killed by this terrorist attack, I ask for an ''aye'' vote in this House today.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SOTO. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

We all agree this was an attack motivated by hate, and today, we recognize the 49 angels we lost and the 53 who were injured during the Pulse nightclub shooting.

Vigils occurred across this Nation, across the political spectrum, after this deadly shooting. I can tell you, on behalf of Congresswoman DEMINGS, Congresswoman MURPHY, myself, and our region, we want to thank everyone for doing that.

We want to thank our colleagues, both Democrats and Republicans, for coming together: Chair GRIJALVA, Ranking Member BISHOP, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN, Mr. FITZPATRICK. We appreciate all the work being done in the Senate.

Today, we recognize the memory of these 49 angels across our Nation by making this the Pulse National Memorial.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SOTO) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3094, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF RULE SUBMITTED BY DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION RELATING TO ''BORROWER DEFENSE INSTITUTIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY''—VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NEGUSE). Pursuant to the order of the House of June 18, 2020, the unfinished business is the further consideration of the veto message of the President on the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 76) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Department of Education relating to ''Borrower Defense Institutional Accountability''.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is, Will the House, on reconsideration, pass the joint resolution, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding?

(For veto message, see proceedings of the House of June 1, 2020, at page H2362.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of overriding the President's veto of H.J. Res. 76, a bipartisan Congressional Review Act resolution that would stop the Department of Education's harmful borrower defense rule from going into effect.

Mr. Speaker, I first want to recognize the hard work of the gentlewoman from Nevada, Representative SUSIE LEE, for her tireless efforts in protecting students, particularly student veterans, from predatory schools.

□ 1145

Borrower defense is a valuable tool to provide relief to student borrowers who are defrauded by predatory institutions. Unfortunately, instead of using the Department's authority to make borrowers whole and give students a second chance at a quality education, it has gone out of its way to prevent victims of fraud from getting relief.

The Department's rewrite of the borrower defense rule, which is set to go into effect on July 1, will mean that a vast majority of defrauded student borrowers will get virtually no relief. Even in cases where a school clearly violates the law, defrauded victims can still be denied relief under the rule if they can't show that the school intentionally defrauded them or they can't file their claim fast enough or they can't document, according to the flawed Department methodology, exactly how much harm they suffered due to fraud.

Even those student borrowers who do receive partial relief will receive significantly less relief than before. Under Secretary DeVos, the average loan discharge amount for approved borrowers has dropped from about $11,000 to about $500, and for many students zero relief will be available even though they can prove massive fraud.

Class actions are not allowed under the rule. Each student must bring an individual case even though the school may have been found to have been guilty of egregious systemic fraud.

Democrats and Republicans came together earlier this year to pass a Congressional Review Act resolution that rejects this rule and prevents the Department of Education from denying borrowers the relief they deserve. A broad coalition, including veterans and military groups, consumer advocates, student advocates, and civil rights groups, called on the President to sign the congressional resolution and protect student borrowers from predatory schools; but, while the President initially indicated support for the resolution, he ultimately chose to veto it.

Today the House has one final opportunity to ensure that defrauded students get the relief they deserve by overriding that veto.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote to override the President's veto.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX), who is the ranking member, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I thank my colleague from Virginia for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition of H.J. Res. 76, a resolution that would overturn the Education Department's effort to assist students who

have been defrauded by colleges and universities while also taking necessary precautions to protect taxpayer interests.

Democrats have resorted to political finger-pointing on this issue at every turn. First, Education and Labor Committee Democrats held a hearing at the end of last year to hurl unfounded and personal attacks at Secretary DeVos. Then they passed H.J. Res. 76 shortly after to overturn the Education Department's borrower defense rules; and now, after President Trump has vetoed this resolution, the Democrats still can't take no for an answer and want to override the President's veto.

As we stand here today—yet again—to watch the Democrats' political games unfold, I would like to begin by highlighting real priorities we are letting fall by the wayside as we waste time debating this partisan resolution.

For starters, we should be working on bipartisan solutions to combat the devastating effects of the coronavirus. We should be addressing the concerns of small businesses—the backbone of our economy—and the workers whose livelihoods are being impacted by this crisis.

Or we could address labor union shortcomings, including the widespread and brazen corruption amongst United Auto Worker, UAW, union leadership. We know the UAW senior union leaders engaged in money laundering, tax fraud, bribery, and embezzlement, yet no action has been taken to examine this abuse of power by union bosses.

Unfortunately, Democrats have a long track record of pursuing ideological objectives at the expense of taxpayers, students, and schools. Today is no different, so I would like to spend some time touching upon the advantages of the Trump administration's new rule and providing context on the Obama-era borrower defense rule and its many shortcomings.

The borrower defense rule was first released by the Education Department in 1994. Borrowers rarely used this process over the next 20 years, until 2015, when a large for-profit school closed. During the final stretch of his Presidency, the Obama administration used this school closure as an opportunity to issue new regulations on borrower defense.

The caveat? A potential $42 billion price tag to be footed by taxpayers that encouraged tens of thousands of borrowers, whether they were harmed or not, to apply to have their loans forgiven. In fact, claim filings for loan forgiveness went from 59 submitted in the first 20 years to roughly 300,000 claims submitted in the last 5 years.

Let me repeat that.

For the first 20 years of the rule, there were 59 claims. Then the Obama administration begins encouraging frivolous appeals, and the appeals jumped to 300,000 and climbing.

This shouldn't come as a surprise. Massive loan forgiveness has long been a Democrat objective, and the Obama rule was a giant leap toward that goal—one that also ignored the high cost to taxpayers.

Furthermore, the Obama administration's regulations were convoluted, blurring the line between fraud and inadvertent mistakes made by schools. The distinction between the two is important because, if institutions are found to engage in fraud, the Education Department can cause schools to close—despite no intentional wrongdoing—through significant financial penalties.

But don't just take my word for it. Colleges and universities, including historically Black colleges and universities, HBCUs, voiced concerns about the Obama regulation. Postsecondary education leaders believed what President Obama's administration proposed could ruin those colleges and universities that did not have large endowments or significant revenue streams like the Ivy League institutions. The Obama rule could shutter the very institutions designed and dedicated to serving low-income, minority, and first-generation students.

Additionally, The Washington Times pointed out: ''Under the Obama rule, students in the coronavirus era who could not attend classes on campus and were forced to take makeshift Zoom classes would have legitimate claims against their schools because the Obama rule does not differentiate between willful misrepresentation and schools' varied responses to the coronavirus. Great for trial lawyers, but bad for students and their schools.''

The Obama regulations created more chaos than clarity, and the Trump administration recognized immediately the need to right these wrongs. So, working with the Education Department, President Trump produced a rule with clearer standards for borrower defense and increased transparency for both students and institutions.

The rule, first and foremost, holds all schools accountable. Students who have been lied to and suffered financial harm are entitled to relief and forgiveness.

Let me repeat that. The Trump administration's borrower defense rule delivers relief to students, including veterans, who have been lied to and suffered financial harm.

In fact, the Obama rule undermined the ability of veterans to earn relief if the institution was considered an elite liberal arts institution. In contrast, President Trump's rule makes sure students have the last word no matter what institution they attend.

Democrats will have you believe that the President and Secretary DeVos want to intentionally harm students who have been defrauded by an institution of higher education, and that is simply not the case.

While my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are willing to spend taxpayer money recklessly, President Trump's rule actually reduces the cost of the 2016 Obama-era regulations by $11 billion because it helps students go to and complete their education rather than closing schools indiscriminately. This is an $11 billion savings for American taxpayers during a time when many are struggling to make ends meet.

Additionally, the Trump borrower defense rule holds all institutions, not just for-profit colleges, accountable for misrepresentations instead of picking winners and losers at considerable cost to taxpayers. It ensures due process for all parties; extends the look-back window to qualify for closed school loan discharges from 120 to 180 days so when schools close more students are eligible for forgiveness; and allows for arbitration, which could result in borrowers recovering resources such as cash payments or other expenses not provided by the Education Department.

Furthermore, this rule is the result of more than 2 years of deliberations, public hearings, and negotiations with higher education stakeholders, as well as considering, incorporating, and responding to public comments on this issue.

Thanks to this regulatory reset, all colleges and universities will be held accountable, defrauded students will see relief, and taxpayer dollars will be better protected.

Republicans stand ready to provide relief to students who have been harmed by fraud, and the borrower defense rule issued by the Trump administration delivers on that front.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge a ''no'' vote on this resolution, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Nevada (Mrs. LEE), who is the sponsor of the resolution and a hard-working member of the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mrs. LEE of Nevada. Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge my colleagues to join me in overriding the Presidential veto of H.J. Res. 76.

Last night, we took a historic vote for racial justice, the Justice in Policing Act. Time and again, Congress takes votes, votes like this one that will soon be forgotten in the media, but these are the votes that quietly perpetuate the systemic inequality and racism in our country. That is what this vote today is about.

Communities of color, minority and low-income students, and veterans are preyed upon by predatory for-profit schools. They are manipulated. They are lied to and they are defrauded.

Because we, the Federal Government, did not do enough to prevent that fraud, we established the borrower defense rule as part of the Higher Education Act as a way to give these students a path to justice and relief. But the Department of Education not only rewrote that rule to make justice for our students virtually impossible, it is also failing to hold these predatory schools accountable for their actions.

Time and time again, we tell young students in this country education is

the answer, and they believe us. But that system failed them. The system failed my constituent, Kendrick Harrison, a brave Iraq war veteran, a father, and a Black American.

Kendrick and his family were left homeless after his for-profit school blew through his GI benefits and convinced him to take out $16,000 in debt right before shutting their doors. He is fighting to this day and working as hard as anyone to get his life back on track.

I promise this story is not an exception. There are over 350,000 students just in recent years who were lied to, manipulated, and defrauded by predatory schools.

So I ask my colleagues: Are you going to stand with these students? Are you going to stand with the system that perpetuates inequality and holds down brave Americans like Kendrick? Are you going to let these for-profit schools wreak havoc on the lives of these students and take advantage of American taxpayers?

Because it is us, American taxpayers, who foot the bill for these bad actor schools because the Department of Education refuses to hold them accountable.

I am ready to take a stand against this broken policy, and I need you to stand with me. Take a stand for the very communities who have been rising up in this country.

These protests over the last several weeks are about police brutality, but they are about so much more. They are about decisions that we make in this body that perpetuate inequality and continue to stack the deck against Black Americans, student veterans, students in poverty, and working people who are just trying to better themselves.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote to override the President's veto. It is time to take a stand.

□ 1200

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON).

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I thank our education Republican leader for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the veto override of H.J. Res. 76.

The Department of Education first released borrower defense rules in 1994, which were rarely used over the next 20 years. After a large for-profit school closed in 2015, the Obama administration used this opportunity to issue new regulations on borrower defense. These regulations could cost the American taxpayer more than $40 billion and encourage tens of thousands of borrowers—whether they were harmed or not—to apply to have their loans forgiven. The 2016 Obama regulations created more chaos than clarity and set massive loan forgiveness of a loan, regardless of the cost to taxpayers.

However, in 2019, the Trump administration issued that new borrower defense rule, which takes effect July 1. The new rule creates clear, consistent standards and procedures for borrowers who have suffered financial harm due to a misrepresentation by a school.

Specifically, the rule:

Ensures due process for all parties;

Holds all institutions—not just for-profits—accountable for misrepresentations;

It delivers relief to students, including veterans, who have been lied to and suffered financial harm;

It preserves student choice, including student veterans in institutions that best suit their educational needs;

And it saves taxpayers $11 billion by incentivizing students to finish their education rather than indiscriminately closing schools.

H.J. Res. 76 would undermine the repeal of the Trump administration's borrower defense rule and go back to Obama regulations that harm students and taxpayers.

Mr. Speaker, for these reasons, I urge my colleagues to oppose this measure.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. DAVIS), the chair of the Subcommittee on Higher Education and Workforce Investment.

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, there are 240,000 defrauded students waiting for student loan relief. Over 40,000 of those students are from my home State of California.

After doing nothing for students who have been defrauded by predatory colleges, the Department has come out with a new borrower defense rule that only makes things worse—in several ways—under the guise of protecting the taxpayer from footing the bill. But we have to remember, our students are taxpayers, too.

This new rule clearly gives preference to the very colleges causing the harm from the borrower defense rule that it was intended to prevent. If a school closes before delivering on its promises to students, they should have automatic discharge of their loans to that institution. Students who have spent years bettering themselves working to get into jobs, sacrificing in the hope of improving financial conditions for their families are being told that they simply don't matter.

Colleges, on the other hand, can use this system to keep taking money and they don't have to deliver what they promise. Our students deserve protection from predatory practices.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution before us today is the first step toward blocking the new fraud borrower defense rule from taking support, and I urge its support.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLER), another great member of the committee.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the attempted veto override of H.J. Res. 76.

When this legislation was advanced through this Chamber in January, the majority sought to turn back the clock on borrower defense leading to dangerous consequences for students, those repaying their loans, and the American taxpayer. The Obama-era rule, which the majority seeks to return us to, in this legislation was marked by regulatory chaos, excessive punishments, and ridiculous costs. The Obama rule provided no clarity and sought to forgive student loans at a massive scale, regardless of the cost to taxpayers or merits of the borrower's case.

Mr. Speaker, most importantly, the Obama-era regulations did not distinguish between deliberate fraud and unintentional errors made by schools, which is critical because the Department can levy substantial financial penalties against institutions found to engage in fraud, which can cause a school to close despite no intentional wrongdoing, thus ending access to alternative avenues for higher education for some current and prospective students.

Estimates put the total cost of the Obama Loan Forgiveness giveaway as high as $40 billion. That is why in 2019, the Trump administration issued the new Borrower Defense Institutional Accountability Rule. The new rule, which takes effect on July 1, provides regulatory clarity; affords due process to both students and institutions; provides students relief relative to actual harm; holds all institutions accountable for misrepresentation; provides students with more options to continue their education, should their school close; and allows for faster relief by allowing institutional level arbitration. Importantly, the 2019 rule is estimated to save taxpayers $11 billion from the 2016 Obama-rule baseline.

Mr. Speaker, we simply cannot afford to return to the outdated, costly, and confusing Obama-era rule. I also urge a ''no'' vote, because with respect to this issue, Congress should stay in its lane.

The Trump administration was rightly using its authority to implement the laws promulgating the new Borrower Defense Institutional Accountability Rule. They did so at a substantial savings to the taxpayer, while protecting student borrowers and holding bad actors accountable.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY), a distinguished member of the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, just a few weeks ago, right before Memorial Day, President Trump very quietly, behind closed doors, vetoed this bill, a bill that protects a borrower defense rule, which was supported by a wide range of veteran service organizations.

For years, young veterans who sought an education after serving their country have been targeted by for-profit, rip-off education factories that swallow up their GI benefits and then pile on new student loans.

Stories abound about men and women who wore the uniform of this country left with crushing debt and worthless degrees that denied them the rewarding careers they were promised. Although many today are entitled to loan forgiveness, the Department of Education, under Secretary Betsy DeVos, has willfully made this process as onerous as possible.

Mr. Speaker, if we listen to the American Legion, the Iraq and Afghan Veterans of America, and the Vietnam Veterans of America, vote to override, and we can restore these victims of fraud and greed some semblance of financial solvency. If we do not override this veto, the share of eligible debt forgiveness will drop from 53 percent to just 3 percent, and we will betray thousands of Americans who stepped up and volunteered to protect our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' to override.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I find it interesting that my colleague would say the President ''very quietly and behind closed doors'' vetoed a bill. They issued a statement on it almost immediately, so it wasn't exactly quietly. Generally, they have to veto a bill at a desk with people present.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ALLEN).

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to voice my strong opposition to overriding President Trump's veto.

We can all agree that no student should be intentionally misled and schools engaging in fraudulent misrepresentation must be held accountable. But the Obama-era borrower defense regulations lack clarity, and simply, did not function. The 2016 regulations did not make the critical distinction between fraud and unintentional mistakes made by schools.

Mr. Speaker, under the rule, the Department of Education can impose significant financial penalties on institutions found to engage in fraud. But with no distinction, this can cause a school to have to close despite no intentional wrongdoing, hurting students on their path to a higher education. That is why President Trump took decisive action and created the 2019 borrower defense rule to clear this up.

Mr. Speaker, the Trump administration's solution delivers relief to students, including veterans, who have been lied to and suffered financial harm. It would also save taxpayers $11 billion by helping students complete their education, rather than indiscriminately closing schools. The Trump rule will ensure due process for all parties, while also ensuring institutions engaging in fraudulent misrepresentation are held accountable.

Mr. Speaker, when Democrats originally brought forward a resolution to disapprove this new commonsense rule, I voted ''no,'' and I will vote ''no'' again today.

I thank President Trump for rightfully using his veto authority, because we cannot go back to the Obama-era regulations that hurt students and taxpayers.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose this measure today.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI), the chair of the Subcommittee on Civil Rights and Human Services.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.J. Res. 76, the veto override.

The Obama administration wrote the original borrower defense rule to provide defrauded students with the debt relief they are entitled to under the Higher Education Act.

Rather than protect students, however, DeVos rewrote the rule to make it nearly impossible for students who are victimized by deceptive institutions to get the relief they deserve. That is not justice.

Mr. Speaker, five months ago, I urged my colleagues to support the resolution to reverse Secretary DeVos' harmful new borrower defense rule. I was glad it passed with bipartisan support.

We are here today because the President has chosen to veto the resolution and stand with Secretary DeVos and unscrupulous institutions that cheated students. This is indefensible.

Mr. Speaker, we are in a challenging time for our country, but this should not be hard. Let's stand with the victims of deception, the students we represent across the country, not with unscrupulous institutions, not with Secretary DeVos, and not with Donald Trump.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join together and override this veto.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DAVID P. ROE).

Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the resolution.

As a ranking member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, I have heard a lot of misinformation about the Department of Education's borrower defense rule and its effects on student veterans.

Here is the truth: The rule does not limit the rights or benefits provided for veterans in the GI bill or servicemembers who use the Department of Defense's Tuition Assistance Program, or the TAP program. Any veteran or servicemember who is defrauded by an institution and took out Federal loans, will have the opportunity to have that claim fairly adjudicated, just like any other student would under the rule.

When I was chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs in 2017, I offered the Forever GI bill to make more veterans eligible to receive a GI bill benefit and make veterans eligible to receive this valuable benefit for life.

Mr. Speaker, 45 years ago, this Army veteran, when he left the Army, used the GI bill. I know how valuable it is, personally, Mr. Speaker. It helped me and my family tremendously, and that is why we wanted to make this benefit a lifetime benefit.

Mr. Speaker, just a few months ago, this Congress passed two bills to protect student veterans whose GI bill benefits were impacted by the coronavirus pandemic. My record has shown that one of my top priorities is ensuring veterans can receive a quality education, and a large part of that is ensuring that they receive the education they were promised and holding schools accountable for fraud.

Mr. Speaker, the Department's rule does just that. And it sets up a clear process for borrowers to have their claim adjudicated and hold institutions of all types accountable. This rule is fair to borrowers. It is fair to schools. It is fair to taxpayers.

Mr. Speaker, I support this rule, and I support the President's veto.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO), a member of the Committee on Education and Labor, but more importantly, chair of the full Committee on Veterans' Affairs, because so many veterans have been implicated by fraud on these institutions.

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, so when the Trump administration and Secretary DeVos approved its new borrower defense to repayment rule late last year, it was clear that they had chosen to pander to the for-profit college industry and cheat thousands of borrowers out of the relief that they deserve.

Predatory for-profit institutions consistently put their profits over students' education. They make false promises about job prospects, drain Federal resources, and leave millions of students with useless degrees and high student loan debt.

Mr. Speaker, yes, veterans are among that group of people, and that is why major veteran service organizations have come out in favor of this veto override in support of the original legislation. Veterans, women, and minorities are aggressively recruited by these institutions who only see them as a benefit to their bottom line:

ITT Technical Institute, Corinthian Colleges, Dream Center Colleges are just some of the predatory for-profits whose lofty promises turned student dreams into a nightmare. The student borrowers who were defrauded by these schools are desperately seeking relief, but Secretary DeVos is making that task nearly impossible. And that is why this year, both Chambers of Congress passed a bipartisan Congressional Review Act resolution that rejected Secretary DeVos' harmful rule.

Students, consumer advocates, and student veteran groups spoke out in favor of this CRA and urged President Trump to sign it into law. But the President refused to heed their call, choosing instead to uphold Secretary DeVos' watered-down rule to put additional burdens on borrowers.

□ 1215

We must override the President's veto. Congress must again stand with student loan borrowers and stop the Trump administration's attack on America's students and his attempts to rig the rule in favor of Secretary DeVos' cronies. More than 200,000 student borrowers are still waiting for relief.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SMUCKER).

Mr. SMUCKER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to today's attempt to override the President's veto.

I think all of us agree that it is important to offer borrowers a process to discharge loans when they have been defrauded by a school, and that is what the rule, crafted with significant stakeholder input, offers. That was the original intent of the borrower defense process when it was enacted in 1995.

However, in 2016, as we have heard, the Obama administration used this process to advance an ideological loan forgiveness scheme, and it worked as they intended. We went from fewer than 60 claims over 20 years to nearly 330,000 claims in 4 years, which would cost the hardworking taxpayers, if you had to pay this price, $40 billion. And they will have to pay that price.

Now, I don't need to go into reasons why that 2016 Obama rule was flawed. Instead, I will highlight some of the improvements made under the new rule.

This rule strengthens protections for borrowers from fraud and applies the same accountability metrics to all institutions across the board.

The rule provides due process for students and institutions but, rightfully, gives students the last word. The rule keeps the standard of evidence the same as the one used by the Obama administration, by the way, and thanks to stakeholder feedback, the rule does not require borrowers to prove intent.

Another point, this new rule will only apply to new claims for loans taken out after July 1.

I do want to thank Secretary DeVos and all of the hardworking individuals at the Department of Education for working through the caseload under the Obama standard. Your hard work of processing more than 5,000 cases per week for borrowers seeking relief has not gone unnoticed.

A vote against this veto override is a vote in favor of creating a system that is fairer for students and taxpayers.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose this resolution.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. ADAMS), the chair of the Workforce Protections Subcommittee and also chair of the HBCU Caucus.

Ms. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this measure to override the President's veto and to stand up for our Nation's 20 million college students.

Secretary DeVos' rule would harm tens of thousands of college students and would allow bad actors to continue some of the worst practices, such as forcing students to sign pre-arbitration agreements that limit their rights. We cannot allow predatory institutions to steal the dream of a college degree from any child.

It is shameful that in his veto message, President Trump used historically Black colleges and universities, HBCUs, as cover for his pro-fraud, anti-student agenda.

Now, let's be clear. No HBCU has ever been implicated in a borrower defense claim, and no HBCU has voiced support for Secretary DeVos' rule. That is fake news.

It is time that President Trump and Secretary DeVos began standing up for North Carolinians seeking opportunity instead of lying down to our Nation's worst institutions. And if they won't do it, Congress will.

It is a fundamental right. Du Bois told us: ''Of all of the civil rights for which the world has struggled and fought . . . the right to learn is . . . the most fundamental.''

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BYRNE).

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to overriding President Trump's veto of H.J. Res. 76.

Everyone in this Chamber can agree that schools that commit fraud and take advantage of students must be held accountable. However, returning to the 2016 borrower defense rule put in place by the Obama administration is not the answer.

Put simply, the Obama-era rule sends millions of taxpayer dollars to those who were not harmed by their university. Under the Obama-era rule, the standard to define fraud was placed so low that the Department of Education saw about 300,000 relief applications in just 5 years. Compare that to the just 59 applications in the previous 20 years the borrower defense process has been in place.

Understanding this problem, the Trump administration released an updated borrower defense rule in 2019 to prevent fraud, ensure taxpayer dollars are spent responsibly, and cut the regulatory red tape that has made it difficult for students and educational institutions to understand the old rule.

The new rule also ensures that due process, a founding principle of our Nation, is in place for both students and institutions.

The cost of allowing the Obama rule to stand is great, over 40 billion taxpayer dollars. Thankfully, the changes made by the Trump administration will save taxpayers billions while still ensuring that students are protected from fraud.

The Trump administration rule applies relief where it is needed, unlike the overly broad Obama-era rule. This should be something both parties can support.

Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that students who are defrauded by educational institutions deserve debt relief, but the Obama-era rule is not the answer.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' and sustain the President's veto.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. JAYAPAL), a distinguished member of the Committee on Education and Labor.

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Speaker, the American people do not support Betsy DeVos.

We don't support her radical attempts to privatize education.

We don't support her corrupt efforts to take coronavirus relief away from public schools so that it can be sent to private ones.

We don't support her hateful, transphobic agenda or her attacks on survivors of sexual assault.

And we do not support her putting predatory, for-profit colleges over those they cheated with a rule that would force the most vulnerable students who were robbed to repay 97 percent of what they borrowed. That is why Congress passed H.J. Res. 76, with bipartisan support.

But just as Vice President PENCE had to save Betsy DeVos' Senate confirmation, President Trump is trying to save her dangerous rule against our bipartisan bill.

So I urge my colleagues to override this veto, and, once again, let's make clear that the people's House stands on the side of the people and not Betsy DeVos.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. WATKINS).

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this costly resolution that would allow more fraud, waste, and abuse.

No one condones fraud, especially when it is perpetrated by an institute of higher learning. Every student who is financially defrauded is entitled to relief and forgiveness, period. But we should make sure that we are helping those who have been defrauded. It is our job to do due diligence for the American taxpayer.

The Trump administration has made this a priority, unlike the Obama administration. They used the rule to forgive as many student loans as they could. They would even target institutions they didn't like. That is partisan. It is costly to the taxpayer, and it is harmful to the student. That is why I support Secretary DeVos and President Trump. Their borrower defense rule takes taxpayers into account.

After seeing the enormous price tag of $42 billion that the Obama rule created, President Trump and Secretary DeVos acted swiftly to take that burden off the backs of the taxpayers. I thank the President and Secretary DeVos.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman

from Pennsylvania (Ms. WILD), a distinguished member of the Committee on Education and Labor.

Ms. WILD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.J. Res. 76.

Students defrauded by predatory, for-profit colleges can be left with crushing debt, useless degrees, and none of the job opportunities they were promised.

Secretary DeVos could provide immediate relief to students who were defrauded. Instead, she has halted student loan relief and written a new rule under which defrauded borrowers could be denied debt relief, even when predatory colleges clearly violated the law.

Earlier this year, bipartisan majorities in the House and the Senate voted together to reject that rule, but President Trump has vetoed our legislation—yet another of his actions that will hurt students and taxpayers.

More than 7,000 Pennsylvanians are suffering while their applications for financial relief are sitting in limbo at the Department of Education. If Congress does not override the President's veto, student borrowers will be harmed, and predatory colleges will receive another giveaway.

I am proud to stand with students and to vote to override the President's veto of H.J. Res. 76.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. GUTHRIE).

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, yet again, to urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on today's vote to override the President's veto of H.J. Res. 76.

It is unconscionable that any institution of higher education would engage in fraudulent misrepresentation to prey on student loan borrowers, particularly veterans who are able to qualify for GI benefits to attend schools.

President Trump's commonsense rule would help students who were defrauded and suffered financial harm by any school, giving them the opportunity to individually make their case, ensuring due process for all parties. It would also save taxpayers $11 billion, compared to President Obama's last-minute, one-size-fits-all rule that did not hold schools accountable.

As a member of the Education and Labor Committee and the former chairman of the Higher Education Subcommittee, I strongly urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' today.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. HARDER), a distinguished member of the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. HARDER of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to encourage my colleagues to vote to protect my constituents who were scammed by for-profit colleges.

Both the House and the Senate took bipartisan votes to protect these students, but the President overruled our votes, siding with Secretary DeVos and her billionaire donors.

This issue hits home for me. I met a woman named Artemisa, who attended a corrupt college in my district. She studied to be a nurse and graduated with $40,000 in debt, but no one would hire her. She is still paying off that debt to this day.

And it is not just Artemisa. Thousands of students at scam colleges across the country have similar stories. And if Secretary DeVos' new plan isn't stopped, these student borrowers may never get the justice they deserve.

That is not what we do in this country.

If Secretary DeVos is concerned about cost, she should talk to her billionaire friends in the corrupt college industry. The criminals should not be putting the financial burden on the victims of this fraud.

I encourage everyone to vote to overturn the President's veto.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS), the chair of the Committee on Financial Services.

□ 1230

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman SCOTT for yielding to me on this important issue.

I rise to override the President's veto of H.J. Res. 76, which undoes a Secretary DeVos rule that would make it nearly impossible for veterans and student borrowers defrauded by their schools to obtain financial relief.

Congress voted, on a bipartisan basis, to reject Secretary DeVos' borrower defense rule, which only cancels 3 percent of the student loans resulting from school misconduct, keeping 97 percent of our veterans and student borrowers drowning in debt they only incurred due to fraud and from which they may never recover.

If Secretary DeVos' efforts to prioritize profit over education are allowed to stand, then the for-profit industry will continue to do what it always has: exploit veterans, student borrowers, and those trying to better their lives and support their families by obtaining an education.

This is a fight with which I am deeply familiar. This Congress, the House Financial Services Committee held two hearings examining the student loan crisis and approved three bills that will provide strong student borrower protections, including for those harmed by for-profit colleges. And during this COVID–19 crisis, I have fought to provide up to $10,000 of relief for private student loan borrowers, and I continue to fight to protect student loan borrowers who should not have to deal with debt collections, negative credit reporting, late fees, and penalties while dealing with this pandemic.

With over 200,000 pending borrower defense applications for loan relief, these students desperately need and deserve our help.

I urge my colleagues to support veterans and student borrowers by overriding the President's veto of H.J. Res. 76.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO), the chair of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I rise to support this override.

Predatory for-profit colleges scam students and taxpayers out of millions of dollars. Predatory for-profit colleges account for 9 percent of students in postsecondary education but 33 percent of defaults.

To help students, the Department of Education under the Obama administration created a streamlined resolution process under the borrower defense to repayment provision of the Higher Education Act. Now, Secretary DeVos is breaking the process.

I will tell you what her goal is. It is to aid the perpetrators, not to help the victims. Under her new rule, borrowers lose out. They lose out if they cannot prove the school intentionally defrauded them, if they cannot file their claim fast enough, or if they cannot document their exact financial harm.

As a result, as little as 3 percent of eligible debt will be forgiven now. What little relief there is now will likely be shouldered by taxpayers, not the schools committing the fraud.

Stopping the Secretary as we are pushing to do has wide support: 20 State attorneys general and nearly 60 advocacy groups for students, civil rights, and education. The American Legion has said: ''Deception against our veterans and servicemembers has been a lucrative scam for unscrupulous actors.''

So I say to my Republican colleagues who want to support the military: Support this override.

And to those of us who want to fight for racial and economic justice: Support this override.

In 2018, we wrote to the Secretary, alarmed about how this rule could hurt students of color: ''Ninety-five percent of Black students attending a for-profit college took out student loans, and a staggering 75 percent of Black students who did not complete their programs defaulted.''

We must act now for veterans, for students of color, for borrowers across this country. In Connecticut, 1,100 defrauded students are waiting to be made whole. They need this override, not that cruel policy. Vote to override.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, before I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island, I would like to remind

our colleagues that just yesterday a Federal court ruled that the Department of Education must provide full relief for 7,200 defrauded Massachusetts student borrowers who attended Corinthian Colleges. Unfortunately, there are still borrowers around the country still waiting for relief.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE), a member of the House Judiciary Committee.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I rise in strong support of the resolution to override the President's veto.

In 2016, the Obama administration issued the borrower defense rule in order to provide relief to student borrowers defrauded by predatory for-profit institutions, which promised an education and credentials to pursue a career only to find these credentials did not have the value they were promised.

In the aftermath of the collapse of institutions like Corinthian Colleges and ITT Technical Institute, the Obama administration sought to provide relief to those students left out in the cold.

The borrower defense rule provided a path to relief to those students who sought to receive an education but were instead left with nothing but debt and few paths forward.

Sadly and predictably, the Trump administration ended these protections and implemented a rule making it harder to obtain relief, siding with predatory for-profit institutions rather than the victims—the students and veterans—of these wrongdoers.

According to the Institute for College Access and Success, the number of students eligible to seek debt relief or loan forgiveness will drop from 53 percent of borrowers under the Obama-era rule to just 3 percent under the Trump rule.

In response, Congress, in a bipartisan way, came together to reject the administration's rule change, rejecting efforts to leave defrauded students out in the cold. The President vetoed this relief. Now, Congress must once again stand on the side of those who sought to obtain a higher education and provide a better life for their lives and family.

I urge adoption of the override resolution.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PORTER), a member of the Financial Services and Oversight and Reform Committees.

Ms. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Under the Higher Education Act, students who are defrauded by private predatory colleges are entitled to relief on their loans. The prior administration created a streamlined process to help defrauded borrowers access relief and move forward with their lives.

Secretary DeVos tried to strip those protections away, but we fought back. Some of my Republican colleagues in the House and Senate voted with us to overturn Secretary Betsy DeVos' new rule. We came together to defend students and to stand up against fraud, waste, and abuse.

But President Trump vetoed this important resolution. Instead of standing with students and taxpayers, President Trump stood with corrupt private colleges and Secretary DeVos.

Today, I ask my Republican friends: Do you want to stand with our country's students, with the future of our workforce and our communities, or do you want to betray them to please the President? I think the choice is clear, and I hope you do, too.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, could you advise how much time is remaining on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Virginia has 9 minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from North Carolina has 7 minutes remaining.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Iowa (Ms. FINKENAUER).

Ms. FINKENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution in overriding the President's veto.

I want to talk about two Iowans who tried taking a step forward but were knocked two steps back by a for-profit school looking for an easy buck and taking advantage of the hopes and dreams of my constituents.

Julie, a mother from Iowa, was looking to boost her career, and Jeff, an Army reservist and construction manager, was trying to continue his education.

They bought into ITT Technical Institute's promises, worked hard for new career opportunities, and took out loans to do it. Both had their lives turned upside down when ITT Technical Institute suddenly closed.

A 2016 Federal rule forgave loans for folks like Julie and Jeff, who were obviously taken advantage of.

Unfortunately, this administration decided to roll back the commonsense rule, weakening protections for borrowers.

In our State, there are more than 1,000 borrowers who were taken advantage of and who are still waiting for their cases to be resolved.

We must stand with them and override the President's veto of this resolution.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. TLAIB), a member of the Financial Services Committee and Oversight and Reform Committee.

Ms. TLAIB. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

In January of this year, I stood here to speak against this administration's continued attack on our students. Five months later, Secretary DeVos, with the support of this administration, continues to work on behalf of predatory for-profit institutions rather than the students they lied to that they scammed.

Instead of ensuring that students who were cheated out of their future by this these fraudulent institutions receive debt relief, Secretary DeVos is fighting to ensure that these institutions are never held accountable.

Both Democratic and Republican Members alike agreed that if you were defrauded by one of these colleges, then your Federal student loan should be forgiven. We must stop this administration's relentless efforts to protect the pockets of predatory corporations at the expense of our students. I am proud to support this veto override.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, contrary to the Democrats' claims that we have heard today, the Trump administration and Republicans in the House are committed to providing relief to students who have been truly harmed by fraudulent practices.

The Obama administration's borrower defense rule, though, was extremely difficult to administer. It left students and institutions confused, encouraged massive and unnecessary loan forgiveness, and created a hefty bill for taxpayers. Anyone who believes it was a streamlined process, I will show you some swampland in New Mexico.

President Trump acted quickly to protect borrowers and taxpayers better. The 2019 borrower defense rule clarified standards and made a process more accessible.

If Democrats overturn the President's veto, we will be left with the convoluted Obama rule. Under the rules associated with today's legislation, there can be no revisions made even to improve or clarify the Obama rule.

We want all schools to serve students well. In particular, we want veterans and their education benefits protected. In this administration, they will be.

Mr. Speaker, I have worked hard all my life to help people get a good education and have a better life. I would not be supporting the overturn of this rule if that was not the direction in which we were going. The Education Department's borrower defense rule protects all student borrowers, including veterans; holds higher education institutions accountable; and saves taxpayers $11 billion.

Unfortunately, Democrats will stop at nothing to tear down meaningful reforms ushered in under President Trump's leadership, even if it comes at the expense of our Nation's students.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard a lot about $11 billion. Let me tell you exactly what that is. That is $11 billion

that students who have been defrauded will now have to pay if this resolution fails.

According to the fraud formula from the Department of Education, even those who can prove fraud can expect relief, on average, to go from about 50 percent of their debt down to 3 percent of their debt. Many, because of that formula, will get absolutely nothing.

□ 1245

Mr. Speaker, now is the time that we have a choice. We can give relief to students, especially veterans who have been defrauded by predatory colleges, or make them pay student loans even though they received a worthless educational experience.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to side with the students and vote ''yes'' on this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is, Will the House, on reconsideration, pass the joint resolution, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding.

Under the Constitution, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 238, nays 173, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 120]

YEAS—238

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Axne
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brindisi
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Case
Casten (IL)
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Cisneros
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Cox (CA)
Craig
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Cunningham
Davids (KS)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny K.
Davis, Rodney
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Engel
Escobar
Eshoo
Espaillat
Evans
Finkenauer
Fitzpatrick
Fletcher
Foster
Frankel
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
García (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Golden
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Green, Al (TX)
Grijalva
Haaland
Harder (CA)
Hastings
Hayes
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Horn, Kendra S.
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Luján
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McAdams
McBath
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Mfume
Moore
Morelle
Moulton
Mucarsel-Powell
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Norcross
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rose (NY)
Rouda
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shalala
Sherman
Sherrill
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Soto
Spanberger
Speier
Stanton
Stevens
Suozzi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres Small (NM)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Van Drew
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wexton
Wild
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth
Young

NAYS—173

Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (NC)
Bost
Brady
Brooks (AL)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Chabot
Cheney
Cline
Cloud
Cole
Collins (GA)
Comer
Conaway
Cook
Crawford
Crenshaw
Davidson (OH)
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dunn
Estes
Ferguson
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxx (NC)
Fulcher
Gaetz
Garcia (CA)
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Gonzalez (OH)
Gooden
Gosar
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hagedorn
Harris
Hartzler
Hern, Kevin
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Hill (AR)
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Hurd (TX)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Keller
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Kustoff (TN)
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
Lesko
Long
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Marshall
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
Meuser
Miller
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Murphy (NC)
Newhouse
Norman
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Pence
Perry
Posey
Reed
Reschenthaler
Rice (SC)
Riggleman
Roby
Rodgers (WA)
Roe, David P.
Rogers (KY)
Rose, John W.
Rouzer
Roy
Rutherford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Shimkus
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smucker
Stauber
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiffany
Timmons
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Waltz
Watkins
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Wright
Yoho
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—19

Abraham
Babin
Barr
Bishop (UT)
Brooks (IN)
Carter (TX)
Curtis
Duncan
Emmer
Gallagher
King (IA)
Marchant
Mullin
Rogers (AL)
Rooney (FL)
Sensenbrenner
Spano
Walorski
Westerman

□ 1327

Mr. WRIGHT changed his vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mrs. LEE of Nevada, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. LEE of California, and Mr. YOUNG changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So (two-thirds not being in the affirmative) the veto of the President was sustained and the joint resolution was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have "nay" on rollcall No. 120.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 965, 116TH CONGRESS

Axne (Raskin)
Cárdenas (Gomez)
DeSaulnier (Matsui)
Deutch (Rice (NY))
Engel (Titus)
Frankel (Kuster (NH))
Garamendi (Boyle, Brendan F.)
Johnson (TX) (Jeffries)
Khanna (Gomez)
Kirkpatrick (Gallego)
Langevin (Lynch)
Lawson (FL) (Evans)
Lewis (Kildee)
Lieu, Ted (Beyer)
Lipinski (Cooper)
Lofgren (Boyle, Brendan F.)
Lowenthal (Beyer)
Lowey (Meng)
Moore (Beyer)
Napolitano (Correa)
Payne (Wasserman Schultz)
Pingree (Kuster (NH))
Sánchez (Roybal-Allard)
Serrano (Meng)
Speier (Scanlon)
Watson Coleman (Pallone)
Welch (McGovern)
Wilson (FL) (Hayes)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The veto message and the joint resolution are referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

The Clerk will notify the Senate of the action of the House.

WASHINGTON, D.C. ADMISSION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HIMES). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to recommit on the bill (H.R. 51) to provide for the admission of the State of Washington, D.C. into the Union, offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLER), on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk will redesignate the motion.

The Clerk redesignated the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 182, nays 227, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 121]

YEAS—182

Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (NC)
Bost
Brady
Brindisi
Brooks (AL)
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Chabot
Cheney
Cline
Cloud
Cole
Collins (GA)
Comer
Conaway
Cook
Craig
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cunningham
Davis, Rodney
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dunn
Estes
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick

Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxx (NC)
Fulcher
Gaetz
Garcia (CA)
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Golden
Gonzalez (OH)
Gooden
Gosar
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hagedorn
Harris
Hartzler
Hern, Kevin
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Hill (AR)
Holding
Hollingsworth
Horn, Kendra S.
Hudson
Huizenga
Hurd (TX)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Katko
Keller
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Kustoff (TN)
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamb
Lamborn
Latta
Lesko
Long
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Marshall
Mast
McAdams
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McKinley
Meuser
Miller
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Murphy (NC)
Newhouse
Norman
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Pence
Perry
Peterson
Posey
Reed
Reschenthaler
Rice (SC)
Riggleman
Roby
Rodgers (WA)
Roe, David P.
Rogers (KY)
Rose, John W.
Rouzer
Rutherford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Shimkus
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Stauber
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiffany
Timmons
Tipton
Torres Small (NM)
Turner
Upton
Van Drew
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Waltz
Watkins
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Wright
Yoho
Young
Zeldin

NAYS—227

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Amash
Axne
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Case
Casten (IL)
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Cisneros
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Cox (CA)
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Davids (KS)
Davidson (OH)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny K.
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Engel
Escobar
Eshoo
Espaillat
Evans
Finkenauer
Fletcher
Foster
Frankel
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
García (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Green, Al (TX)
Grijalva
Haaland
Harder (CA)
Hastings
Hayes
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Luján
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Massie
Matsui
McBath
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Mfume
Moore
Morelle
Moulton
Mucarsel-Powell
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Norcross
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rose (NY)
Rouda
Roy
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shalala
Sherman
Sherrill
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (WA)
Soto
Spanberger
Speier
Stanton
Stevens
Suozzi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wexton
Wild
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—21

Abraham
Babin
Barr
Bishop (UT)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Carter (TX)
Curtis
Duncan
Emmer
Gallagher
Griffith
King (IA)
Marchant
McHenry
Mullin
Rogers (AL)
Rooney (FL)
Sensenbrenner
Spano
Walorski

□ 1408

Mr. SCHNEIDER, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Mr. YARMUTH, and Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay''.

Mr. GONZALEZ of Ohio changed his vote from ''nay'' to ''yea''.

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 965, 116TH CONGRESS

Axne (Raskin)
Cárdenas (Gomez)
DeSaulnier (Matsui)
Deutch (Rice (NY))
Engel (Titus)
Frankel (Kuster (NH))
Garamendi (Boyle, Brendan F.)
Johnson (TX) (Jeffries)
Khanna (Gomez)
Kirkpatrick (Gallego)
Langevin (Lynch)
Lawson (FL) (Evans)
Lewis (Kildee)
Lieu, Ted (Beyer)
Lipinski (Cooper)
Lofgren (Boyle, Brendan F.)
Lowenthal (Beyer)
Lowey (Meng)
Moore (Beyer)
Napolitano (Correa)
Payne (Wasserman Schultz)
Pingree (Kuster (NH))
Sánchez (Roybal-Allard)
Serrano (Meng)
Speier (Scanlon)
Watson Coleman (Pallone)
Welch (McGovern)
Wilson (FL) (Hayes)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. HICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3 of House Resolution 965, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 232, nays 180, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 122]

YEAS—232

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Axne
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brindisi
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Case
Casten (IL)
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Cisneros
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Cox (CA)
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Cunningham
Davids (KS)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny K.
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Engel
Escobar
Eshoo
Espaillat
Evans
Finkenauer
Fletcher
Foster
Frankel
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
García (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Golden
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Green, Al (TX)
Grijalva
Haaland
Harder (CA)
Hastings
Hayes
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Horn, Kendra S.
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Luján
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McAdams
McBath
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Mfume
Moore
Morelle
Moulton
Mucarsel-Powell
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Norcross
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rose (NY)
Rouda
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shalala
Sherman
Sherrill
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (WA)
Soto
Spanberger
Speier
Stanton
Stevens
Suozzi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres Small (NM)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wexton
Wild
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NAYS—180

Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (NC)
Bost
Brady
Brooks (AL)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Chabot
Cheney
Cline
Cloud
Cole
Collins (GA)
Comer
Conaway
Cook
Crawford
Crenshaw
Davidson (OH)
Davis, Rodney
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dunn
Estes
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxx (NC)
Fulcher
Gaetz
Garcia (CA)
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Gonzalez (OH)
Gooden
Gosar
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hagedorn
Harris
Hartzler
Hern, Kevin
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Hill (AR)
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hudson

Huizenga	Moolenaar	Stauber
Hurd (TX)	Mooney (WV)	Stefanik
Johnson (LA)	Murphy (NC)	Steil
Johnson (OH)	Newhouse	Steube
Johnson (SD)	Norman	Stewart
Jordan	Nunes	Stivers
Joyce (OH)	Olson	Taylor
Joyce (PA)	Palazzo	Thompson (PA)
Katko	Palmer	Thornberry
Keller	Pence	Tiffany
Kelly (MS)	Perry	Timmons
Kelly (PA)	Peterson	Tipton
King (NY)	Posey	Turner
Kinzinger	Reed	Upton
Kustoff (TN)	Reschenthaler	Van Drew
LaHood	Rice (SC)	Wagner
LaMalfa	Riggleman	Walberg
Lamborn	Roby	Walden
Latta	Rodgers (WA)	Walker
Lesko	Roe, David P.	Waltz
Long	Rogers (KY)	Watkins
Loudermilk	Rose, John W.	Weber (TX)
Lucas	Rouzer	Webster (FL)
Marshall	Roy	Wenstrup
Massie	Rutherford	Westerman
Mast	Scalise	Williams
McCarthy	Schweikert	Wilson (SC)
McCaul	Scott, Austin	Wittman
McClintock	Shimkus	Womack
McHenry	Simpson	Woodall
McKinley	Smith (MO)	Wright
Meuser	Smith (NE)	Yoho
Miller	Smith (NJ)	Young
Mitchell	Smucker	Zeldin

NOT VOTING—19

Abraham	Duncan	Rogers (AL)
Babin	Emmer	Rooney (FL)
Barr	Gallagher	Sensenbrenner
Bishop (UT)	King (IA)	Spano
Brooks (IN)	Luetkemeyer	Walorski
Carter (TX)	Marchant	
Curtis	Mullin	

□ 1441

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BABIN. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted: ''no'' on rollcall No. 120 (Veto message to accompany H.J. Res. 76—Borrower Defense CRA); ''yes'' on rollcall No. 121 (MTR on H.R. 51—Washington DC Admission Act); and ''no'' on rollcall No. 122 (Final Passage of H.R. 51—Washington DC Admission Act).

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Speaker, on June 26th, I was unable to be present in the House Chamber to cast my vote on two pieces of legislation. If present, I would have voted ''nay'' on passage of H.J. Res. 76 (RC 120), ''yea'' on the Motion to Recommit (RC 121), and ''nay'' on passage of H.R. 51 (RC 122).

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to vote on June 26, 2020, due to not being in D.C. Had I been present, I would have voted as follows: ''no'' on rollcall No. 120; ''yes'' on rollcall No. 121; and ''no'' on rollcall 122.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 965, 116TH CONGRESS

Axne (Raskin)	Johnson (TX) (Jeffries)	Lofgren (Boyle, Brendan F.)
Cárdenas (Gomez)	Khanna (Gomez)	Lowenthal (Beyer)
DeSaulnier (Matsui)	Kirkpatrick (Gallego)	Lowey (Meng)
Deutch (Rice (NY))	Langevin (Lynch)	Moore (Beyer)
Engel (Titus)	Lawson (FL) (Evans)	Napolitano (Correa)
Frankel (Kuster (NH))	Lewis (Kildee)	Payne (Wasserman Schultz)
Garamendi (Boyle, Brendan F.)	Lieu, Ted (Beyer)	Pingree (Kuster (NH))
	Lipinski (Cooper)	
Sánchez (Roybal-Allard)	Watson Coleman (Pallone)	Wilson (FL) (Hayes)
Serrano (Meng)	Welch (McGovern)	
Speier (Scanlon)		

ESTABLISHING JOINT CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE ON INAUGURAL CEREMONIES

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 38) to establish the Joint Congressional Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies for the inauguration of the President-elect and Vice President-elect of the United States on January 20, 2021, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. DINGELL). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

S. CON. RES. 38

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring),

SECTION 1. ESTABLISHMENT OF JOINT COMMITTEE.

There is established a Joint Congressional Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies (in this resolution referred to as the ''joint committee'') consisting of 3 Senators and 3 Members of the House of Representatives, to be appointed by the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, respectively. The joint committee is authorized to make the necessary arrangements for the inauguration of the President-elect and Vice President-elect of the United States on January 20, 2021.

SEC. 2. SUPPORT OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE.

The joint committee—

(1) is authorized to utilize appropriate equipment and the services of appropriate personnel of departments and agencies of the Federal Government, under arrangements between the joint committee and the heads of those departments and agencies, in connection with the inaugural proceedings and ceremonies; and

(2) may accept gifts and donations of goods and services to carry out its responsibilities.

The concurrent resolution was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess for a period of less than 15 minutes.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1459

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. DINGELL) at 2 o'clock and 59 minutes p.m.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. FERGUSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. FERGUSON. Madam Speaker, I rise for the purpose of inquiring of the majority leader the schedule for the week to come. I yield to my friend from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the majority leader.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman from Georgia for yielding.

Madam Speaker, on Monday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for morning-hour debate. I would repeat that because it is unusual. On Monday, we are meeting at 9 a.m. for morning-hour debate and 10 a.m. for legislative business, with votes expected to occur as early as 2:30 p.m.

On Tuesday and Wednesday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for morning-hour debate and 10 a.m. for legislative business.

On Thursday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business.

The House will consider H.R. 1425, the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Enhancement Act. This bill will significantly increase the ACA's affordability and subsidies, lower prescription drug prices, expand coverage, and crack down on junk plans, while strengthening protections for people with preexisting conditions and addressing racial health disparities.

The House will also consider, Madam Speaker, H.R. 7301, which is the Emergency Housing Protection and Relief Act of 2020. This bill would authorize nearly $200 billion for the dire housing needs arising due to the COVID–19 pandemic.

H.R. 7301, which was included in the HEROES Act, would help renters and homeowners by extending the eviction and foreclosure moratoria and providing $100 billion for emergency rental assistance; $75 billion for homeowners assistance to cover mortgages, property taxes, and utilities; and more than $11 billion for homeless assistance programs.

I would again reiterate that that bill passed as a part of the HEROES Act, which is now pending in the Senate.

Lastly, the House will consider H.R. 2, the Moving Forward Act. This bill would invest more than $1.5 trillion in modern, sustainable infrastructure, while creating millions of good-paying jobs; combating the climate crisis; and addressing disparities in urban, suburban, and rural communities.

The bill includes a 5-year reauthorization of the surface transportation program, invests in schools with the Reopen and Rebuild America's Schools Act, invests over $100 billion in our Nation's affordable housing infrastructure, delivers affordable high-speed broadband internet access to all parts of the country, and promotes new clean renewable energy infrastructure.

We expect, at that point in time, to be out on Thursday for the July Fourth break. I would tell the House that the 2 weeks that will follow the July

Fourth weekend will be reserved, as were the first weeks in June, for committees to do their work, in particular, the National Defense Authorization Act being considered by the House Armed Services Committee.

That bill is, obviously, very lengthy. It composes a little more than half of the discretionary spending, and we expect the committee to need substantial time to mark up that bill.

In addition, the Appropriations Committee will be marking up its 12 bills for consideration by the House.

Then, the last 2 weeks, we will be taking the products that will not be limited to the NDAA and the appropriations bills, but we will be primarily taking up the time with other legislation that will be promoted and sent to the floor for consideration by the committees.

Mr. FERGUSON. Madam Speaker, I very much appreciate that update.

Question: Does the gentleman expect to consider amendments to H.R. 2, the transportation bill, on the floor next week?

I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. Yes. I talked to Mr. MCCARTHY yesterday. Obviously, because of the timeframe that the COVID–19 health strictures have imposed upon us, it takes a long time to vote on amendments. So, rather than consider amendments individually, the leader and I talked about having amendments either in manager's amendments or in amendments that have a lot of individual amendments within them. And they will be considered en gros so that there may well be a lot of amendments, but we hope to hold the votes down to a manageable level.

As the gentleman knows, votes have been taking about an hour. If we took every amendment seriatim, frankly, we wouldn't finish until September. So, we are trying to manage that, and we are working with the minority leader.

Mr. FERGUSON. Madam Speaker, I am happy to hear that. But it seems kind of odd that this week, when we were considering the police reform bill, there were no amendment considerations.

I believe the majority leader, Madam Speaker, said on the floor that we have constraints on amendments because of the coronavirus. So I ask, if there were amendment constraints this week, do those same constraints exist next week?

Mr. HOYER. No, it turns out that we considered the bill in the House the same way the majority leader in the Senate wanted to consider the Scott bill, or the Republican policing bill. So, both Houses wanted to consider them, apparently, in the same way.

Mr. FERGUSON. Well, I certainly appreciate that, but I was a little disappointed this week, in the fact that I thought we had a chance to make the police reform bill better. It was a genuine effort on both sides of the aisle to have this discussion.

But once again, the Republican voice was left out. There were some really good amendments and ideas from my side that simply did not gain consideration on the floor, and they should have.

One such example was the Cline amendment that really would have discouraged collective bargaining agreements with organizations that really kind of had poor officer disciplinary tactics, something that could have fundamentally changed how departments operate in big cities.

But anyway, it is a disappointment. I hate that we did not get to do that.

Mr. HOYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. We are hopeful that the Senate will pass a bill. I know that my friend will say, Well, yes, but it is the Democrats that stopped the bill.

Let me tell the gentleman, I genuinely hope that we have a bill passed by the Senate, that we go to conference, and that we adopt a bill that can garner the support of the majority of the House and the Senate and can be signed by the President of the United States.

As I said on the floor when we considered the bill, KAREN BASS, the Congressional Black Caucus, and those of us who strongly supported the bill, we don't want to send a message. We want to make a difference. To the extent that making a difference requires us to have agreement between the two parties, I am hopeful we will get to that objective.

Mr. FERGUSON. Reclaiming my time, those words are fine now. But when we talk about having agreement and talk about having those discussions, Madam Speaker, clearly, the committee and this body should be considering it as an entire body. The opportunity for us to consider those amendments here on the floor of the House is really important.

But we understand that the minority in the Senate blocked debate and continuation of Mr. Scott's bill, Senator SCOTT's bill, which was, quite candidly, an excellent piece of legislation. If anyone has not seen his remarks on the Senate floor and his speech, I would highly encourage you to do it.

That was a disappointment. But then, to hear the majority leader say that we are going to eliminate debate in this House simply to do it in conference, I think we deserve a better opportunity than that.

But I understand. You are in the majority, and that is the way that you all have chosen to do that. But, hopefully, we can get to that point where we can have those honest debates right here on the House floor.

Mr. HOYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. For just a minute.

Mr. HOYER. The gentleman will surely note that when his party was in power and was scheduling bills, you had the most closed rules of any Congress in the history of the Congress.

Mr. FERGUSON. It seems to me that I voted on a lot more amendments last year than I have this year. We probably did have more closed bills, but we seemed to have a lot more legislative activity. It seemed to be a lot more productive.

But anyway, Madam Speaker, another thing that is concerning to me is that I am disappointed about what has transpired in the House over the recent weeks. For the first time in 230 years, Members had to elect to come to D.C. to represent their constituents, but they no longer need to do that. Instead, they can now turn their voting cards over to another Member, including Speaker PELOSI, or any other Member, and have them vote in their place using this new proxy vote scheme.

One thing that I am thankful for is that the covered period for this laid out by the Speaker comes to an end July Fourth, and we look forward to seeing all the Members come back to do their jobs.

Since many States are fully reopened, and even here in D.C., phase 2 reopening is in its place, and you can go to restaurants and gyms. As a matter of fact, we can even now go to the House gym again. And most employees are returning to work.

With that said, I would like to confirm with the gentleman that he does not plan to extend the July Fourth covered period and continue this absurd proxy voting scheme.

Mr. HOYER. First of all, of course, I reject emphatically the premise that this is absurd. As the gentleman knows, there were some 70, some weeks ago, who cast a vote. There were 30 today. They cast their votes because they were concerned about their health or families' health to whom they would return.

I think the gentleman probably has been reading, as well, and maybe listening to the extraordinary spike in cases that have been identified and the concern that hospital beds will be overrun.

We will end this when the medical community, not somebody who has no medical knowledge and very little command of the facts, tells us it is time to get together again. When he told people to do that, they did get together, 10 of whom apparently work for the White House who have gotten infected, and, frankly, spikes in Florida, Texas, Arizona, and, yes, even California and some other States as well, including Arkansas.

Now, I am not sure exactly what the figures are in the gentleman's State. But, Madam Speaker, I believe that we are going to continue to be concerned about the health of the Members, the health of the staff, the health of the people who cover us on behalf of the American people.

So, I can't tell the gentleman whether it is going to end because I can't tell you when the pandemic is going to end.

I can't tell you when the spike in the numbers of people who are getting sick or people who are dying is going to end.

But I can tell you that we will be very sensitive to the risks, and we will act accordingly.

Mr. FERGUSON. Well, certainly, we want to be safe and thoughtful about what we do. But I think America—I think we have done an excellent job of what we set out to do, which was not to stop the spread of this virus, but it was to slow the spread of the virus.

Not a single one of us, not a single person in America, wanted to see one of our fellow Americans suffer because there was no room for them in a healthcare facility where they needed it. And I think that we have done that. I think America has shown that they have had the discipline to say at home and to bend the infection rate curve down.

So, sure, there will be more Americans that contract COVID. But thank goodness that our healthcare system is strong enough and intact that we have the capacity to take care of the most vulnerable.

Speaking of that, I think, as I have watched a lot of the news, a lot of the data, I am very, very, very concerned about the most vulnerable in our Nation. I think one of the most horrific things that has happened seems to be the blatant disregard for rules from CDC and CMS by some Governors, where they returned COVID-positive patients to the nursing homes, where they were able to infect the most vulnerable.

So, I would ask the majority leader, do you think that there will be legislation considering how to protect our patients in nursing homes and also to really hold those accountable that violated the rules and were reckless with our fellow Americans' lives?

Mr. HOYER. Will the gentleman from Georgia yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. I hesitate to ask the gentleman a question I don't know the answer to, so I won't. But I don't know which Governors the gentleman is talking about. But I will, certainly, want to find that out from the gentleman at some point in time.

Mr. FERGUSON. Reclaiming my time for just a minute, sir, I would refer you to the special committee led by the gentleman from South Carolina, Mr. CLYBURN. And I would refer you to the data that is coming out of that committee that clearly indicates where those particular States are.

Mr. HOYER. Let me tell the gentleman that we certainly intend to continue, as I said, to try to protect the American people. A lot of people have died. Over 122,000 people have died.

Mr. FERGUSON. And every one is a tragic loss.

□ 1515

Mr. HOYER. The President of the United States said this virus was a hoax.

Because he said it was a hoax, people thought they didn't have to worry about it. I tell my friend from Georgia, a hoax. He is a gentlemen who refuses to set the example of wearing a mask, which the science and medical people say we ought to do, a gentleman who really shunted aside much of the science and medical advice that he got.

So I tell the gentleman we hope that the President is as concerned as my friend has stated he is, and I know that I am and I think all of our Members are.

Mr. FERGUSON. Madam Speaker, reclaiming my time, I am certainly glad to hear that my colleague from Maryland is truly committed to making sure that every single American stays as safe as they possibly can. When those incidents occurred where rules were violated, regulations were disregarded, there was, in fact, harm caused to our fellow Americans.

I tell my friend I am glad to know he is as committed to getting to the bottom of that as well, because I believe he is a man of honor and integrity. I believe his commitment to lead it to going to where the data and facts are, I tell my friend I am awfully glad to hear that.

Mr. HOYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I hope the gentleman has as high an expectation for the President of the United States as he has of others.

Mr. FERGUSON. Oh, Madam Speaker, not only is there an expectation, there is gratitude for the work that the President and the administration have done to get information out, to expand testing, to go out to make sure that the resources were delivered to our colleagues in the great State of New York, resources there to build extra hospital beds that nursing home patients could have gone to but, unfortunately, were sent back to their nursing homes.

Yes, I am grateful not only for his commitment to America, but I am grateful for the fact that he has helped lead this country and will continue to lead this country back. So, yes, we should all expect a lot of ourselves. We should be committed to the greatness of this country, as I know that we all are.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

PROTECTING YOUR CREDIT SCORE ACT OF 2019

Ms. WATERS. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1017, I call up the bill (H.R. 5332) to amend the Fair Credit Reporting Act to ensure that consumer reporting agencies are providing fair and accurate information reporting in consumer reports, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1017, the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Financial Services, printed in the bill, modified by the amendment printed in part C of House Report 116–436, is adopted, and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 5332

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''Protecting Your Credit Score Act of 2020''.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

SEC. 2. ESTABLISHMENT OF ONLINE CONSUMER PORTAL LANDING PAGE FOR CONSUMER ACCESS TO CERTAIN CREDIT INFORMATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 612(a)(1) of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681j(a)(1)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(D) ONLINE CONSUMER PORTAL LANDING PAGE.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this subparagraph, each consumer reporting agency described in section 603(p) shall jointly develop an online consumer portal landing page that gives each consumer unlimited free access to—

''(I) the consumer report of the consumer;

''(II) the means by which the consumer may exercise the rights of the consumer under subparagraph (E) and section 604(e);

''(III) the ability to initiate a dispute with the consumer reporting agency regarding the accuracy or completeness of any information in a report in accordance with section 611(a) or 623(a)(8);

''(IV) the ability to place and remove a security freeze on a consumer report for free under section 605A(i) and (j);

''(V) if the consumer reporting agency offers a product to consumers to prevent access to the consumer report of the consumer for the purpose of preventing identity theft, a disclosure to the consumer regarding the differences between that product and a security freeze as defined under section 605A(i) or (j);

''(VI) information on who has accessed the consumer report of the consumer over the last 24 months, and, as available, for what permissible purpose the consumer report was furnished in accordance with section 604 and section 609; and

''(VII) the credit score of the consumer in accordance with section 609(f)(7).

''(ii) NO WAIVER.—A consumer reporting agency described in section 603(p) may not require a consumer to waive any legal or privacy rights to access—

''(I) a portal established under this subparagraph; or

''(II) any of the services described in clause (i) that are provided through a portal established under this subparagraph.

''(iii) NO ADVERTISING OR SOLICITATIONS.—A portal established under this subparagraph may not contain any advertising, marketing offers, or other solicitations.

''(iv) EXTENSION.—The Bureau may allow the consumer reporting agencies an extension of 1 year to develop the online consumer portal landing page required under clause (i).

''(v) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subparagraph may be construed as requiring a consumer reporting agency to disclose confidential proprietary information through the online consumer portal landing page.

''(E) OPT-OUT OPTION.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—If a consumer reporting agency sells consumer information in a manner that is not included in a consumer report, the consumer reporting agency shall provide each consumer with a method (through a website, by phone, or in writing) by which the consumer may elect, free of charge, to not have the information of the consumer so sold.

''(ii) NO EXPIRATION.—An election made by a consumer under clause (i) shall expire on the date on which the consumer expressly revokes the election through a website, by phone, or in writing.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 612(f)(1) of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681j(f)(1)) is amended, in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by adding ''or that is made through the online consumer portal landing page established under subsection (a)(1)(D),'' after ''subsections (a) through (d),''.

SEC. 3. ACCURACY IN CONSUMER REPORTS.

Section 607(b) of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681e) is amended to read as follows:

''(b) ENSURING ACCURACY.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—In preparing a consumer report, each consumer reporting agency shall follow reasonable procedures to assure maximum possible accuracy of the information concerning the consumer to whom the report relates.

''(2) MATCHING INFORMATION IN A FILE.—In assuring the maximum possible accuracy under paragraph (1), each consumer reporting agency described in section 603(p) shall ensure that, when including information in the file of a consumer, the consumer reporting agency—

''(A) matches all 9 digits of the social security number of the consumer with the information that the consumer reporting agency is including in the file; or

''(B) if a consumer does not have a social security number, matches information that includes the full legal name, date of birth, current address, and at least one former address of the consumer.

''(3) PERIODIC AUDITS.—Each consumer reporting agency shall perform periodic audits, on a schedule determined by the Bureau, on a representative sample of consumer reports of the agency to check for accuracy.''.

SEC. 4. IMPROVED DISPUTE PROCESS FOR CONSUMER REPORTING AGENCIES.

(a) RESPONSIBILITIES OF FURNISHERS OF INFORMATION TO CONSUMER REPORTING AGENCIES.—Section 623 of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681s–2) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(8)—

(A) in subparagraph (E)(ii), by inserting ''and consider'' after ''review''; and

(B) in subparagraph (F)—

(i) in clause (i)(II), by inserting '', and does not include any new or additional information that would be relevant to a reinvestigation'' before the period at the end; and

(ii) by adding at the end the following new clause:

''(iv) NEW OR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION.—For purposes of clause (i)(II), the term 'new or additional information'—

''(I) means information of a type designated by the Bureau; and

''(II) does not include information previously provided to the person.''; and

(2) in subsection (b)(1), by inserting ''and consider'' after ''review''.

(b) BUREAU CREDIT REPORTING OMBUDSPERSON.—Section 611(a) of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681i(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(8) BUREAU CREDIT REPORTING OMBUDSPERSON.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this paragraph, the Bureau shall establish the position of credit reporting ombudsperson, whose specific duties shall include carrying out the Bureau's responsibilities with respect to—

''(i) resolving persistent errors that are not resolved in a timely manner by a consumer reporting agency; and

''(ii) enhancing oversight of consumer reporting agencies by—

''(I) advising the Director of the Bureau, in consultation with the Office of Enforcement and the Office of Supervision of the Bureau, on any potential violations of paragraph (5) or any other applicable law by a consumer reporting agency, including appropriate corrective action for such a violation; and

''(II) making referrals to the Office of Supervision for supervisory action or the Office of Enforcement for enforcement action, as appropriate, in response to violations of paragraph (5) or any other applicable law by a consumer reporting agency.

''(B) REPORT.—The ombudsperson shall submit to the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate an annual report including statistics and analysis on consumer complaints the Bureau receives relating to consumer reports, as well as a summary of the supervisory actions and enforcement actions taken with respect to consumer reporting agencies during the year covered by the report.''.

(c) RESPONSIBILITIES OF CONSUMER REPORTING AGENCIES.—Section 611 of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681i) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by adding at the end the following:

''(D) OBLIGATIONS OF CONSUMER REPORTING AGENCIES RELATING TO REINVESTIGATIONS.—Commensurate with the volume and complexity of disputes about which a consumer reporting agency receives notice, or reasonably anticipates to receive notice, under this paragraph, each consumer reporting agency shall—

''(i) maintain sufficient personnel to conduct reinvestigations of those disputes; and

''(ii) provide training with respect to the personnel described in clause (i).'';

(B) in paragraph (6)(B)—

(i) by amending clause (ii) to read as follows:

''(ii) a copy of the consumer's file and a consumer report that is based upon such file as revised, including a description of the specific modification or deletion of information, as a result of the reinvestigation;'';

(ii) by striking clause (iii) and redesignating clauses (iv) and (v) as clauses (vi) and (vii), respectively;

(iii) by inserting after clause (ii) the following:

''(iii) a description of the actions taken by the consumer reporting agency regarding the dispute;

''(iv) if applicable, contact information for any furnisher involved in responding to the dispute and a description of the role played by the furnisher in the reinvestigation process;

''(v) the options available to the consumer if the consumer is dissatisfied with the result of the reinvestigation, including—

''(I) submitting documents in support of the dispute;

''(II) adding a consumer statement of dispute to the file of the consumer pursuant to subsection (b);

''(III) filing a dispute with the furnisher pursuant to section 623(a)(8); and

''(IV) submitting a complaint against the consumer reporting agency or furnishers through the consumer complaint database of the Bureau or the State attorney general for the State in which the consumer resides;'';

(C) by striking paragraph (7) and redesignating paragraph (8) as paragraph (7); and

(D) in paragraph (7), as so redesignated, by striking ''paragraphs (2), (6), and (7)'' and inserting ''paragraphs (2) and (6)''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(h) NOTIFICATION OF DELETION OF INFORMATION.—A consumer reporting agency described in section 603(p) shall communicate with other consumer reporting agencies described in section 603(p) to ensure that a dispute initiated with one consumer reporting agency is noted in a file maintained by such other consumer reporting agencies.''.

SEC. 5. INJUNCTIVE RELIEF.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 616 (15 U.S.C. 1681n)—

(A) in subsection (a), by amending the subsection heading to read as follows: ''DAMAGES'';

(B) by redesignating subsections (c) and (d) as subsections (d) and (e), respectively; and

(C) by inserting after subsection (b) the following:

''(c) INJUNCTIVE RELIEF.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—In addition to any other remedy under this section, a court may award injunctive relief to require compliance with the requirements imposed under this title with respect to any consumer.

''(2) ATTORNEY'S FEES.—In the event of any successful action for injunctive relief under this subsection, a court may award to the prevailing party reasonable attorney's fees (as determined by the court) incurred by the prevailing party during the action.''; and

(2) in section 617 (15 U.S.C. 1681o)—

(A) in subsection (a), in the subsection heading, by striking ''(a) IN GENERAL.—'' and inserting ''(a) DAMAGES.—'';

(B) by redesignating subsection (b) as subsection (c); and

(C) by inserting after subsection (a) the following:

''(b) INJUNCTIVE RELIEF.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—In addition to any other remedy under this section, a court may award injunctive relief to require compliance with the requirements imposed under this title with respect to any consumer.

''(2) ATTORNEY'S FEES.—In the event of any successful action for injunctive relief under this subsection, a court may award to the prevailing party reasonable attorney's fees (as determined by the court) incurred by the prevailing party during the action.''.

(b) ENFORCEMENT.—Section 615(h)(8) of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681m(h)(8)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''section'' and inserting ''subsection''; and

(2) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''This section'' and inserting ''This subsection''.

SEC. 6. INCREASED TRANSPARENCY.

(a) DISCLOSURES TO CONSUMERS.—Section 609 of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681g) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(3)(B)—

(A) in clause (i), by striking ''and'' at the end; and

(B) by striking clause (ii) and inserting the following:

''(ii) the address and telephone number of the person; and

''(iii) the permissible purpose, as available, of the person for obtaining the consumer report, including the specific type of credit product that is extended, reviewed, or collected, as described in section 604(a)(3)(A).'';

(2) in subsection (f)—

(A) by amending paragraph (7)(A) to read as follows:

''(A) supply the consumer with a credit score through the portal established under section

612(a)(1)(D) or upon request by the consumer, as applicable, that—

''(i) is derived from a credit scoring model that is widely distributed to users by that consumer reporting agency for the purpose of any extension of credit or other transaction designated by the consumer who is requesting the credit score; or

''(ii) is widely distributed to lenders of common consumer loan products and predicts the future credit behavior of the consumer; and''; and

(B) in paragraph (8), by inserting '', except that a credit score shall be provided free of charge to the consumer if requested in connection with a free annual consumer report described in section 612(a) or through the online consumer portal landing page established under section 612(a)(1)(D)'' before the period at the end; and

(3) in subsection (g)(1)—

(A) in subparagraph (A)(ii)—

(i) in the clause heading, by striking ''SUBPARAGRAPH (D)'' and inserting ''SUBPARAGRAPH (C)''; and

(ii) by striking ''subparagraph (D)'' and inserting ''subparagraph (C)'';

(B) in subparagraph (B)(ii), by striking ''consistent with subparagraph (C)'';

(C) by striking subparagraph (C); and

(D) by redesignating subparagraphs (D) through (G) as subparagraphs (C) through (F), respectively.

(b) NOTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) ADVERSE INFORMATION NOTIFICATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681 et seq.) is amended—

(i) in section 612 (15 U.S.C. 1681j), by striking subsection (b) and inserting the following:

''(b) FREE DISCLOSURE AFTER NOTICE OF ADVERSE ACTION OR OFFER OF CREDIT ON MATERIALLY LESS FAVORABLE TERM.—Not later than 30 days after the date on which a consumer reporting agency receives a notification under subsection (a)(2) or (h)(6) of section 615, or from a debt collection agency affiliated with the consumer reporting agency, the consumer reporting agency shall make to a consumer, without charge to the consumer, all disclosures that are made to a user of a consumer report in accordance with the rules prescribed by the Bureau.''; and

(ii) in section 615(a) (15 U.S.C. 1681m(a))—

(I) by redesignating paragraphs (2), (3), and (4) as paragraphs (3), (4), and (5), respectively;

(II) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following:

''(2) direct the consumer reporting agency that provided the consumer report that was used in the decision to take the adverse action to provide the consumer with the disclosures described in section 612(b);''; and

(III) in paragraph (5), as so redesignated—

(aa) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking ''of the consumer's right'';

(bb) by striking subparagraph (A) and inserting the following:

''(A) that the consumer shall receive a copy of the consumer report with respect to the consumer, free of charge, from the consumer reporting agency that furnished the consumer report; and''; and

(cc) in subparagraph (B), by inserting ''of the right of the consumer'' before ''to dispute''.

(B) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 604(b)(2)(B)(i) of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681b(b)(2)(B)(i)) is amended by striking ''section 615(a)(3)'' and inserting ''section 615(a)(4)''.

(2) NOTIFICATION IN CASES OF LESS FAVORABLE TERMS.—Section 615(h) of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681m(h)) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking ''paragraph (6)'' and inserting ''paragraph (7)'';

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking ''paragraph (6)'' and inserting ''paragraph (7)'';

(C) in paragraph (5)(C), by striking ''may obtain'' and inserting ''shall receive'';

(D) by redesignating paragraphs (6), (7), and (8) as paragraphs (7), (8), and (9), respectively; and

(E) by inserting after paragraph (5) the following:

''(6) REPORTS PROVIDED TO CONSUMERS.—A person who uses a consumer report as described in paragraph (1) shall notify and direct the consumer reporting agency that provided the consumer report to provide the consumer with the disclosures described in section 612(b).''.

(3) NOTIFICATION OF SUBSEQUENT SUBMISSIONS OF NEGATIVE INFORMATION.—Section 623(a)(7)(A)(ii) of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681s–2(a)(7)(A)(ii)) is amended by striking ''with respect to'' and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting ''without providing additional notice to the consumer, unless another person acquires the right to repayment connected to the additional negative information. The acquiring person shall be subject to the requirements of this paragraph and shall be required to send consumers the written notices described in this paragraph, if applicable.''.

SEC. 7. CONSUMER REPORTING AGENCY REGISTRY.

Section 621 of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681s) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(h) CONSUMER REPORTING AGENCY REGISTRY.—

''(1) ESTABLISHMENT OF REGISTRY.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Bureau shall establish a publicly available registry of consumer reporting agencies that includes—

''(A) each consumer reporting agency that compiles and maintains files on consumers on a nationwide basis;

''(B) each nationwide specialty consumer reporting agency;

''(C) all other consumer reporting agencies that are not included under section 603(p) or 603(x); and

''(D) links to any relevant websites of a consumer reporting agency described under subparagraphs (A) through (C).

''(2) REGISTRATION REQUIREMENT.—The Bureau shall establish a deadline, which shall be not later than 270 days after the date of the enactment of this subsection, by which each consumer reporting agency described in paragraph (1) shall be required to register in the registry established under such paragraph.''.

SEC. 8. AUTHORITY OF BUREAU WITH RESPECT TO CONSUMER REPORTING AGENCIES.

Section 1024(a)(1) of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (12 U.S.C. 5514(a)(1)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (D), by striking ''or'' at the end;

(2) in subparagraph (E), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; or''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(F) is a consumer reporting agency described under section 603(p) of the Fair Credit Reporting Act.''.

SEC. 9. BUREAU STANDARDS FOR PROTECTING NONPUBLIC INFORMATION.

Title V of the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act (15 U.S.C. 6801 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 501, by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(c) CONSUMER REPORTING AGENCY SAFEGUARDS.—The Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection shall establish, by rule, appropriate standards for consumer reporting agencies described under section 603(p) of the Fair Credit Reporting Act relating to administrative, technical, and physical safeguards to protect records and information as described in paragraphs (1) through (3) of subsection (b).'';

(2) in section 504(a)(1)(A), by striking '', except that the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection shall not have authority to prescribe regulations with respect to the standards under section 501''; and

(3) in section 505(a)(8), by inserting '', other than under subsection (c) of section 501'' after ''section 501''.

SEC. 10. REPORT ON DATA SECURITY RISK ASSESSMENTS IN EXAMINATIONS OF CONSUMER REPORTING AGENCIES.

Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection shall assess whether examinations conducted by the Director of consumer reporting agencies described under section 603(f) of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681a(f)) include sufficient processes to addresses any data security risks to the consumers of such agencies on which such agencies maintain and compile files. Along with the first semiannual report required under section 1016(b) of the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5496(b)) to be submitted after the 90-day period after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director shall submit to Congress a report containing the results of such assessment that includes—

(1) recommendations for improving the processes to addresses any such data security risks; and

(2) the progress of the Director on making any improvements described under paragraph (1).

SEC. 11. GAO STUDY ON THE USE OF SOCIAL SECURITY NUMBERS.

(a) STUDY.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall carry out a study on the feasibility and means of consumer reporting agencies replacing the use of social security numbers as identifiers with another type of Federal identification.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than the end of the 2-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall issue a report to the Congress containing all findings and determinations made in carrying out the study required under subsection (a).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill, as amended, shall be debatable for 1 hour, equally divided among and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services.

The gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. WATERS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 5332 and to insert extraneous material thereon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Ms. WATERS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5332, the Protecting Your Credit Score Act of 2020.

I would like the thank Representative GOTTHEIMER, the bill's sponsor, for all of his hard work and leadership on this important and bipartisan legislation. He worked extensively for most of last year to seek the input and support of our colleagues on both sides of the aisle, making improvements along the way.

Our credit reporting system is badly broken, and consumers have little recourse. It should be no surprise that consumer complaints regarding credit reporting errors and failed attempts to fix these errors are consistently a top complaint submitted to the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau and the Federal Trade Commission. This demonstrates that millions of consumers are frustrated with the current system and need our help.

H.R. 5332 would direct the nationwide consumer reporting agencies to create a streamlined, single online portal for consumers to have easy access to free credit reports, credit scores, dispute errors, and place security freezes.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCHENRY. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 5332.

I want to first thank the gentleman from New Jersey for his work on this bill. I am disappointed we were not able to come to a bipartisan compromise. We worked for the better part of a year to try to achieve a good product that could broadly be supported. This product does not represent that work, sadly. Unfortunately, we didn't get there.

I believe that we are considering, today, a bill that is just another attempt for House Democrats to socialize the credit reporting and scoring industry. We are voting on a bill that will decrease competition, increase fraud, prop up the trial bar, and expand authority of an already unaccountable CFPB, Consumer Financial Protection Bureau.

First, this bill directs the three nationwide credit reporting agencies to create a shared online portal. This portal will allow unlimited and free consumer access to credit information—this is good—and credit freezes. This is good and allows consumers to initiate disputes.

That all sounds very good. In fact, Republicans support a one-stop shop for consumers to access important credit information. But we are talking about the three largest players in the industry, and this bill codifies their place—their oligopoly structure and their favored view of the current marketplace—and enshrines them further into law with this outsized authority.

This bill condones their market structure by mandating that many of their services be merged into a single web portal. This doesn't make things better; it makes it worse.

If Congress really wants to protect consumers, we should be working to promote more competition in the credit reporting and scoring industry. We should be promoting new ways to eliminate barriers to entry, not promoting what really comes down to less consumer choice.

Second, this bill requires the complete Social Security numbers be used to confirm the consumer's identity. So here is the problem: The bill fails to set appropriate standards to protect that information. Specifically, the bill directs the credit reporting agencies to match all nine digits of a consumer's Social Security number before including any information in consumer credit reports.

That sounds well, fine, and good, but we know hacks happen. As Federal employees, we have had our information hacked and sold. Just look at the credit reporting agencies. They have had their information hacked and sold. This is why we wanted to come to a bipartisan compromise.

There is something legitimate we should be doing, but today, not all data furnishers collect full Social Security numbers for submission for consumer credit information to the credit bureaus. That means this bill has a requirement now that they collect all the Social Security information to confirm the consumer's identity. This will potentially have two negative consequences for consumers.

First, data that is not already linked to that Social Security number will be excluded from credit bureaus. That means, under this bill, accurate information will be removed for no other reason than it is missing the Social Security number.

This will actually decrease the predictive power of credit files. That is a negative for consumers. That, in turn, will jeopardize the ability to get low-cost credit for consumers, especially for those who are on the margin where much of their information is derived by being a consumer and paying back regular consumer debt.

Second, data furnishers will start aggressively capturing and storing Social Security numbers for consumers just so the data can be used in the credit models. That means that our Social Security number will be in more places and identity theft can then increase with more opportunities to steal our information. It means that consumers will be further at peril for fraudulent activities by bad and malicious actors.

So committee Republicans have consistently expressed concern with the private sector and government use of Social Security numbers for identity verification. I think we should all agree on that. This bill will only exacerbate the problem by statutorily directing an increase in reliance on this very highly personal information.

Next, this bill creates an additional opportunity for trial lawyers to exploit the litigation system, ultimately raising the cost of credit for all consumers.

The bill expands the private right of action under the Fair Credit Reporting Act to allow for injunctive relief. It further provides plaintiffs with compensation for attorney fees, and more litigation means increased costs associated with credit reporting.

Additionally, this bill allows consumers to continuously dispute information even if the account is verified as accurate, promoting an endless cycle of frivolous reinvestigations and decreasing the effectiveness of credit reporting.

Lastly, this bill continues the Democrats' goal of expanding the statutory authority of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, or the CFPB. The bill creates duplicative ombudsmen in the CFPB for credit reporting, something that they currently have, but the person has more than just consumer credit reporting responsibilities.

Since its creation, congressional Republicans have fought to place this unaccountable government agency under the annual appropriations process and have argued that the single-Director structure is unconstitutional. That is being litigated and will be decided by the Supreme Court this summer.

While the current CFPB Director is working to increase the accountability and transparency at the agency, we don't know what the next Director will do, if he or she will abuse his or her power. We should fix the CFPB before we expand their authorities.

□ 1530

Madam Speaker, I also want to take issue with a larger set of issues here.

The Democrats' decision to report out a closed rule means that you can't even have the ultimate goal of a bipartisan bill that can then get action in the Senate and then, potentially, get a signature by the President.

This, too, is a sad sign of the state of affairs in what seems to be a highly broken legislative process that we are in the midst of. It further demonstrates my point that my colleagues, in particular, on the other side of the aisle have no interest in working with Republicans to craft a bill that protects consumers' personal information.

I submitted amendments to the Committee on Rules that provide for targeted solutions:

Eliminating this reliance on Social Security numbers;

Removing paid non-elective debt from credit reports—which this bill fails to do;

Allowing parents to electronically freeze their minor's credit report—which this bill fails to do;

Requiring sources for public record data in credit reports, which would then expand credit files so that those who are on the margins for creditworthiness would have enhanced credit potentially;

Prohibit the inclusion of adverse information relating to predatory mortgage lending;

Financial abuse or fraud associated with private student loans in credit reports. This bill does not act;

And directing the GAO to study and report to Congress on the use of nontraditional data and credit scoring, this is something that has bipartisan support in our committee and has been reported out in other measures, but not in this one.

And so those are sensible measures that could have been included if we had

an open amendment process. But then, again, we are wearing masks, we are conducting business in this odd way, where Members can vote for other Members that are not here on the House floor and we have to go through this whole long process. So I understand they have a need to rush, right, but this is an ill-conceived bill that will have a negative impact on every American—every American—if this is signed into law.

Madam Speaker, I think we need better consideration and a better product that could actually achieve a bipartisan outcome.

Let's vote ''no'' on this, and let's get on with the real work of the American people.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. WATERS. Madam Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GOTTHEIMER), author of this bill and a member of the Committee on Financial Services.

Mr. GOTTHEIMER. Madam Speaker, I thank the chairwoman for allowing me to speak today on behalf of my bipartisan legislation, H.R. 5332, the Protecting Your Credit Score Act of 2020.

Madam Speaker, since I took office, I have been committed to helping protect seniors and other vulnerable communities from fraud and to protect their financial well-being. Like many of my colleagues, constituents in my district are feeling the economic pain caused by the ongoing pandemic.

Just this week, in fact, a constituent of mine, Patricia from Wantage, New Jersey, reached out to me to ask: What can we do as policymakers to help protect people's credit during this crisis?

Madam Speaker, I am proud that we were able to provide Americans with debt and credit relief as part of the bipartisan CARES Act, protecting homeowners in forbearance and Federal student loan borrowers. We were able to continue to work to do so with the bipartisan HEROES Act, which has yet to become law. It is in the Senate now waiting action. And that act, including suspending negative credit reporting during the pandemic, giving Americans time to recover economically before there is a risk of being hit on their credit reports. It is also time that we look at the way hardworking Americans are able to track and ensure accuracy in their credit reports so that their scores are where they need to be as we progress into our economic recovery.

Madam Speaker, I really want to thank Chairwoman WATERS for her impactful leadership and partnership on this bipartisan bill and her incredibly supportive and smart team. I also thank Ranking Member MCHENRY for spending so many months working with me in such a constructive and cooperative manner. My bill reflects a lot of his wise input. I, too, am sorry we weren't able to find ultimate common ground. I also want to thank my good friend and co-chair of the Problem Solvers Caucus, TOM REED, for his work cosponsoring this important legislation.

Madam Speaker, after working on this bill for a year, I was proud when the bill was reported favorably out of the Committee on Financial Services on December 11, 2019.

I am also proud the House last night passed the landmark George Floyd Justice in Policing Act. We must continue to come together as a country to fight for racial justice on all fronts, and to combat inequalities that have plagued this Nation for too long, which includes the ability to access credit.

Credit affects all communities, impacting what Americans pay for a car, whether they can get a mortgage for a house, the rates on a credit card, and how much they can receive for a small business loan. The impact it has is especially strong on communities of color. And experts have testified to the Committee on Financial Services that the credit reporting system is biased, particularly against these communities.

Running this crucial part of our economy are three companies in the United States that literally hold the keys to the kingdom. It is an oligopoly. They decide Americans' credit fate and whether they should get access to credit, and it is all done in a closed-off system behind the drapes. And we don't know what goes on, how they develop those scores.

I am very glad the ranking member is interested in trying to get more competition into that process. And I am very eager—and I am sure the committee is, too—to work together on that front.

I am also glad that there are areas that he would like to go further on overall when it comes to access to credit. And I am also eager to sit down as well.

Madam Speaker, the bottom line is these three credit bureaus come up with their own magic number: Your credit score. Houdini, himself, could not figure out how these credit scores are calculated. They have their own secret formula. It impacts every aspect of your life, as I said, from your car loan to your mortgage, and it is up to you to track it and beg them to fix inaccuracies when they arise, which is far too often, and most often not your fault.

The best way to discover whether there are errors on your credit report is to check your three reports from these companies, and FCRA currently only gives consumers the right to view their report for free once every 12 months.

Otherwise, you have got to pay out of your own pocket and chase down these three credit bureaus—anywhere from $9.95 a report to $15.95 a report. Experts recommend that you check your report before applying for any new line of credit or making a large purchase or renting or buying a home because a mistake can easily seriously affect your credit. It could lead to more costs and things like rising interest rates that would affect your loans, and even worse, you may be ineligible to qualify for financing altogether.

The Federal Trade Commission has previously found that one in 5 consumers have verified errors in their reports, not of their own making. And one in 20 consumers have errors so serious that they would be denied credit or need to pay more for it. That adds up to 42 million Americans with errors in their credit and 10 million with errors that can be life-altering.

We also now live in a world where data breaches are a constant threat. Unfortunately, every year 15.4 million Americans are victims of credit card fraud—42,000 people every single day.

According to the Merchant Risk Council, 80 percent of all credit cards are compromised. And the Identity Theft Resources Center has reported that as of June 11, there have been 475 reported data breaches already this year, exposing more than 5 million records. And once you are a victim, almost immediately the criminals, they start in. They apply for new cards, for mortgages, for loans, for cars—anything else they can get their hands on, all under your name—affecting your credit score within these three credit bureaus. And it is vital that these fraudsters be caught immediately and not be allowed to cause further damage undetected between the one free annual report.

It has happened to my sister, to my constituents, to people I know. And I am sure everyone out there knows someone this has happened to. And when someone is the target of this fraud right now, it is up to the victim to fix these issues. They receive all of the burden of chasing after these three companies with their own systems and procedures and beg them for help. And that can take 3 to 6 months.

Madam Speaker, my bipartisan legislation with Congressman TOM REED from New York asked the private sector, not the government, to help fix this. And this is a big distinction here that I want to point out to the ranking member, this is driven by the private sector, not the government, to fix this issue. My bipartisan bill sets up a one-stop shop online portal to check your credit report for free at any time. It allows victims to shut off the ability of credit crooks from using your information to apply for credit under your name.

The portal will also provide the ability to initiate and resolve disputes between you and the credit bureau, and you will be able to see who the bureaus have sold your data to in the prior 2 years. Because, yes, they take your data and they go make money on your information.

Madam Speaker, the bill strengthens cybersecurity safeguards of information held by consumer reporting agencies, to help prevent a repeat of the

2017 Equifax data breach. The bill also asks the GAO to examine the most secure and accurate marker to track your credit, whether it is your Social Security number or another Federal identifier. And this is very important.

I am glad the ranking member raised this issue, because I agree. We should find the best possible identifier that is most secure, and that is exactly what this study is all about because we need to make sure we keep your identity secure. By creating this one-stop portal, all three credit bureaus will now have to work together to help protect you and make your lives better, not the other way around.

And I understand the issue that is raised about the security and making sure that this is not handed off to someone. That is why, again, as I say, the private sector will develop these websites.

And to a point about this that was raised: If my friend is actually really concerned, and he thinks that these three bureaus don't have secure websites now, well then we better get them here immediately and find out why he is worried about that and if they actually should be more secure. Because what we are asking them to do is develop a website just like they have now, which I hope—and I will ask the companies again—I hope that they are doing everything possible to keep their own websites secure.

Madam Speaker, well, my own sister had her credit hacked last year. She told me she was lucky to get a day off from her job to figure all this out. She had to sit on the phone and chase everyone. But what if you don't have the ability to take a day off to sit on the phone with each credit company and chase down every single issue? Our bipartisan legislation will help fix this and help Americans protect what they spent a lifetime building, and that is their credit.

Madam Speaker, I am also proud, lastly, to have the support of several businesses and consumer groups. Vince Malta, the President of the National Association of Realtors, sent a letter to me this week on the bill, which states: ''Access to free credit scores, transparency in the reporting process and use of consumer credit information high standards for vetting credit information, and a reliable method for contesting and correcting inaccurate information are critical to a vibrant housing market and economy.''

Other supporting groups include the National Consumer Law Center, the Consumer Federation of America, Consumer Action, and World Privacy Forum.

Madam Speaker, while we did not earn the support of every group—and I recognize that—I am proud that even among those who disagree with us acknowledged the efforts that we took in order to work towards a bipartisan agreement. I will continue to work to make every effort to reach consensus, and I appreciate their acknowledgment of that effort.

Madam Speaker, finally, let me say that during an economic downturn and throughout the years we are going to spend recovering from it, Americans' financial security will and must be paramount.

We have already seen spikes in fraud throughout this pandemic, especially related to direct payments and different types of loans. And the chairwoman has worked overtime in all of our bills to make sure we do everything possible to protect Americans during this time. I am grateful for her leadership.

Madam Speaker, as we recover from this crisis, I want to make sure Americans can protect their credit and resolve disputes that may arise. As SEC Chairman CLAYton testified just yesterday to the House Committee on Financial Services, for a consumer, the best thing you can do for yourself is understand your credit and get your credit under control.

We need a modernized system that empowers all consumers, especially those facing new challenges with this new pandemic, with transparency and the ability to correct errors to their credit reports, and to make sure everyone can have access to credit so that they can have a home, a car, and enjoy everything that everyone who works hard should have access to.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense bipartisan bill, which will help every American.

Mr. MCHENRY. Madam Speaker, I highlight for the bill's sponsor that first with the Equifax data breach, it is proof that the industry could use better data standards.

Second, making sure that they have the fullness of the Social Security numbers only means that when they steal that information, they also steal our full Social Security numbers so they can have full action for fraudulent activity and identity testimony. That, we know, and it should have been addressed in this bill, and it is a failure of this legislation and the reason why I oppose it.

Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LOUDERMILK), the ranking member on the Task Force on Artificial Intelligence.

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Madam Speaker, I thank our ranking member for not only yielding, but his fine leadership in this committee.

I also appreciate my colleague, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, sponsor of this legislation. I appreciate his leadership on this, and I truly believe he did work very hard in a bipartisan manner to try to come to an agreement. And unfortunately, we just weren't able to close that gap. And I hope that going forward we will be able to do that, because this is something that we do support on this side with the certain constraints to protect the consumers' identity.

One of my major concerns on this is cybersecurity. As was spoken about earlier, the bill would create an online portal for consumers to access their credit reports from all three major credit bureaus in one place. The idea is a good idea, and very worth discussing and very worth pursuing. But in its current state, it would be a massive amount of sensitive data in one place, so it must be done in a way that is cybersecure to make sure that the information doesn't lead to more fraud and more identity theft.

As someone who has spent many years in the IT sector, as I know my good colleague, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, has as well, I am very concerned about the potential of breaches of this portal.

We all remember the 2017 Equifax data breach that exposed the financial information of millions of Americans, and the last thing we should be doing is increasing the chance of that kind of event happening again. But this bill has the potential to do that very thing because it does not include robust cybersecurity protections to make sure the information on the portal is secure.

□ 1545

Another worthy goal of the bill is to make it easier for consumers to dispute errors in their credit reports. But the bill allows consumers to repeatedly dispute the same information on their credit reports, even if it is found to be accurate, which would lead to unnecessary and frivolous disputes.

Another significant concern I have with this bill is that it would expand the authority of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau. The CFPB is an unaccountable regulatory agency that took many rogue actions under the previous administration.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle know that expanding the CFPB's power is a nonstarter for Republicans; therefore, I cannot support this bill. I ask my colleagues to oppose this bill.

Ms. WATERS. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GOTTHEIMER).

Mr. GOTTHEIMER. Madam Speaker, just one point I want to bring back up, if I may. I want to thank my friend for his comments, and I appreciate his work and our efforts together here.

The one point about the Social Security number that I want to raise is, the bill requires a study at the GAO to see what the best answer is, whether if that is a Federal identifier number or a Social Security number, whatever the best answer is.

I know we spent a lot of time talking about this. I, too, am very concerned with making sure that we have the best possible outcome to protect people and protect their information.

So if the GAO comes back and says that we need to develop a new Federal identifier so that we keep it separate from the Social Security number, then, to me, that would be the best outcome. That is exactly why the bill requires the GAO to study this.

Again, just one other point, if we are concerned about current security and cybersecurity.

Mr. MCHENRY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOTTHEIMER. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. MCHENRY. What I am highlighting is the fact that, in one section of the bill, you have the study to say whether or not using Social Security numbers is good or bad. I think that is good. That was laudable.

The problem is, in another part of the bill, you mandate immediately that they need the fullness of the Social Security numbers in order for the data to be included. That is what I am highlighting, and that is one of the rubs that I have with the bill.

Mr. GOTTHEIMER. Reclaiming my time.

Yes, they also have a period of time to develop the site. It is not going to happen overall. In that period of time, we will get direction on what the best outcome is in terms of using a Federal identifier, and we will execute against that as we develop this site.

Back to the site. If the oligopoly of the three bureaus—if right now our concern is that their sites are not secure, then we better have them in immediately and have them take us through their sites again. Because if you are still concerned about this—

Mr. MCHENRY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOTTHEIMER. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. MCHENRY. I commend Chairwoman WATERS for bringing the three CEOs in.

Mr. GOTTHEIMER. Right, right. I remember that.

Mr. MCHENRY. We, on a bipartisan basis, beat them up, which is a rare thing in Congress. We beat them up because they had a massive data breach that exposed our data. That is why I sincerely wanted to get to the bottom of this and have a bipartisan bill.

This is not a result of this product.

Mr. GOTTHEIMER. Reclaiming my time.

Just one question on that. Do you feel now that the three are still insecure? And are you concerned about them?

Mr. MCHENRY. For sure, for sure. That is why I want to get to a solution. This bill, sadly, incorporates none of the conditionalities that I wanted.

Mr. GOTTHEIMER. Reclaiming my time.

Does the gentleman agree that we should have them back in immediately, again, to talk to them and find out if they have made progress?

Mr. MCHENRY. The point is, we could have had a massive vote on something that reformed them rather than bring them in and wag our finger again.

Mr. GOTTHEIMER. The whole point is that, because they are still insecure, we better let people actually have access to their data all the time. That is what this bill does, so they can find out, instead of having to pay 10 bucks or 15 bucks every time to see if these sites are secure. That is my concern.

I thank the gentleman. I think we are good.

Mr. MCHENRY. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

What I would say, very simply, Madam Speaker, is that we could have had a bipartisan solution here. That is what I was offering. Give up the private right of action, so you don't have more lawsuits, and give up your view of a government-centric portal that basically enshrines these big three. Those are two additions.

The final kicker is this: End the reliance on Social Security numbers and put the date in the future, and the technology solution will be there. That is an industry mandate that I offered as a matter of compromise.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUDD), my colleague from Davie County, North Carolina, a great leader on the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. BUDD. Madam Speaker, I want to rise in strong opposition to H.R. 5332, the Protecting Your Credit Score Act of 2019.

Although I will not be supporting the gentleman from New Jersey's legislation, I want to make sure that people know that I consider him a friend, and I thank him for his efforts to try to bring reform to the credit reporting industry.

There are some good ideas in this bill, such as the one-stop-shop approach for consumers to freeze and unfreeze their credit for all three nationwide bureaus that we have just talked about, as well as access to credit reports and scores.

But even this idea is taken too far in the bill, and it leaves too many unanswered questions about exactly how it is going to be carried out.

Now, it is really unfortunate that a bipartisan compromise was not reached. I know the ranking member and his staff worked tirelessly on this with the gentleman from New Jersey and his staff.

But there are a few other points I want to make. You know, it is a chief priority for committee Republicans to protect consumers' personal information. That is something that both sides have brought up.

Yet, we are preparing to vote on a bill that still makes Social Security numbers the primary way to identify a person, despite the fact that we know Social Security numbers threaten consumers' personal information. Worse yet, the bill will mandate furnishers to match all nine Social Security digits.

Another concern with this bill is the creation of yet another ombudsman at the CFPB to deal exclusively with consumer reporting agencies. This provision is unnecessary and duplicative. The CFPB already has an ombudsman to deal with consumer-facing issues. There is no logical reason why the proposed authorities cannot simply be given to the existing ombudsperson. This is simply another move by the Democrats to expand the statutory authority of the unaccountable CFPB.

Madam Speaker, I urge opposition to this bill.

Ms. WATERS. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CASTEN), a member of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. CASTEN of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5332, the Protecting Your Credit Score Act. I support this bill because, like so many Americans, I personally know the frustration of dealing with erroneous marks on your credit report and thought I would share a recent story.

About a month ago, I got a letter from a bank where I don't have an account, Bank of America. They were thanking me for something that I didn't recognize. So, I did what all good Americans do: I threw it in the recycle bin and moved on with my day.

The next day, I got a similar letter from Navy Federal Credit Union, where I also do not have an account. This one had a summary of my credit score and was shortly followed with another note saying that my account was overdrawn by $3,250.

I am going to be honest. The only reason that the Navy Federal Credit Union letters got my attention and didn't end up in the recycling bin is because they were addressed to Lieutenant Commander SEAN CASTEN. I have been called a lot of things in this job, but that is a rank that I have never earned.

A few phone calls and a similar overdraft notification from Bank of America later, and I had fraud alerts placed on both accounts.

On the advice of the banks, I called TransUnion to ensure this wouldn't show up on my credit report. The agent was helpful. At the end of the call, she said: ''Is there anything else I should know?''

And I just couldn't resist telling her: ''Only that I am a member of the House Financial Services Committee with oversight of you, and I appreciate how helpful you have been.''

Now, I tell that story because I was able to correct this. But I can imagine a ton of other scenarios where I don't check the recycling, where I am not alleged to be a commissioned naval officer, where I hadn't been in enough committee hearings on this subject to recognize fraud early on. And in all those scenarios, this story has a much less happy ending.

But those incidents happen every day to an awful lot of Americans. We know 21 percent of consumers had verified errors in their credit reports. Thirteen percent had errors that affected their credit scores. Five percent had errors serious enough to cause them to be denied or pay more for credit. But those are only the accounts we know about.

Many don't know where to turn or have the resources or the time to correct them. Fraudulent or accidental marks on a credit report can have a life-altering consequence, so it is important that those reports are correct.

But credit scores and reports are a critical gatekeeper for Americans' financial well-being and access to the

most basic building block of the American Dream.

It is determinative in setting premiums for auto and homeowner's insurance. It informs landlords on which renters they want to rent their apartments to. Your score determines if you must make a bigger deposit to get your utilities.

That is why this bill is so important. It creates an online consumer portal where consumers will have free and unlimited access to their consumer reports and credit scores.

Allowing consumers the ability to initiate disputes about credit report accuracy—rather than all the rigmarole I had to go through—and to place or remove a security freeze, is a critical tool that allows Americans the control and the ability to remedy those errors.

It is 2020. It is long past time to modernize the way that consumers address errors on their credit scores.

I thank Representative GOTTHEIMER for introducing this bill, and I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes.''

Mr. MCHENRY. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. RIGGLEMAN).

Mr. RIGGLEMAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 5332, the Protecting Your Credit Score Act.

I would like to thank the ranking member for his leadership, but also my colleague from New Jersey. Not only is he a friend, but I respect him very much, and I do applaud his efforts on this legislation.

I share his interest in ensuring credit reports are complete, accurate, and transparent, but I believe this bill fails to achieve that goal.

The passage of H.R. 5332 will have harmful and unintended consequences for consumers. It is, simply put, yet another veiled attempt to socialize the credit reporting and scoring industry that will cause harm to hardworking Americans.

This bill is disguised as pro-consumer, but H.R. 5332 will decrease competition, increase the cost of credit for consumers, provide opportunities for trial attorneys to exploit the litigation system, and expand the authority of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau.

It undermines the Fair Credit Reporting Act and our ability to maintain a nationwide credit reporting system that benefits businesses and consumers. This bill would create a conflicting patchwork of interpretations of the Fair Credit Reporting Act that will lead to confusion among financial institutions and raise costs for all consumers.

While my colleague named this bill the Protecting Your Credit Score Act of 2019, it does little to protect consumers and their data. Quite to the contrary, it expands and increases the risk of harm to consumers affected by a data breach.

This bill mandates the three nationwide credit reporting agencies create a shared online portal and would create significant cybersecurity vulnerabilities for consumers and companies, all while creating opportunities for bad actors to manipulate and take advantage of our consumer data.

I know a little bit about this because I have done this for about 22 years.

Creating a one-stop-shop for the credit report, personal information, and Social Security number of every individual would be disastrous in the event of a cyber hack or data breach.

We need to find targeted solutions that focus on increasing the cybersecurity capability at credit reporting agencies, increase competition, and increase access to credit for consumers and businesses, rather than put forward proposals that undermine the consumer reporting system and further empower unelected bureaucrats at the expense of the free market.

Ms. WATERS. Madam Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time I have remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman has 12½ minutes remaining.

Ms. WATERS. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GOTTHEIMER).

Mr. GOTTHEIMER. Madam Speaker, I thank Mr. RIGGLEMAN for his points. He is a good friend, and I respect him deeply.

I disagree here, respectfully. The whole point of this is to protect consumers. Giving consumers more data to have access to about themselves and to understand their own credit scores and their own credit history and have more transparency into their own lives does not hurt them; it helps them.

That is exactly what we are doing today, so that if you are hacked, if you are one of the millions of Americans whose credit is stolen every single day and you are trying to put your credit life back together, not by your own making, because someone did it to you, and they are opening accounts and doing things to you, what this legislation will do is help you.

Instead of having to spend hours chasing down the three bureaus and hoping that they actually do what they say they are going to do and put your credit back together, so that when you want a house and a mortgage, or you want a car, and you want to do the things that you have worked very hard to build your credit for, someone else who stole your credit won't be able to undermine that. That is what this bill does.

One point, just to clarify this important point that the ranking member made. The bill does not mandate the collection of Social Security numbers. It simply requires that credit bureaus match the information they already have on file to ensure that Jane Doe in Illinois who defaults on her payments does not impair the credit of Jane Doe in Indiana.

One of the biggest reasons consumers have errors in their files is because of the mixed files when negative information is assigned to the wrong person.

It is, once again, another reason why we need a place for consumers to go to get free access to their reports, to file complaints immediately, to contest issues when they see them, and to make sure their credit isn't sold off to someone else right underneath them.

That is the point of this. And why we are having a GAO study is to make sure we find the best way, the most secure way, to do this going forward.

This legislation protects consumers; it protects Americans; and it doesn't look out for the oligopoly. We need more competition there. It looks out for the American consumer, and that is the point.

□ 1600

Mr. MCHENRY. Madam Speaker, I think that since this is such a critical issue, we should count up how many hearings we had in the Financial Services Committee. We had one in February of 2019.

We could have gotten to the bottom of these things if we actually had multiple hearings to figure this stuff out. Instead, we got a parsing bill on the floor that doesn't achieve the things that we needed to achieve.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. STEIL).

Mr. STEIL. Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague from North Carolina for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the act.

Like many of my colleagues, I am committed to ensuring that all consumers can have faith in the validity of their credit score. Unfortunately, the bill fails to achieve that goal. It puts consumers at greater risk of having their information stolen.

It threatens to increase the cost of credit by creating more opportunities for trial lawyers and by making scores less protected.

Further, it expands the jurisdiction of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, which is completely unaccountable to Congress.

Credit scores are an essential part of our financial system. Both Republicans and Democrats, I believe, agree on that point. We also agree that many Americans have difficulty accessing their credit due to their poor or insufficient credit histories.

With that in mind, we should work together to enhance cybersecurity at credit reporting agencies, reduce fraud, and help consumers get the relief they need in times of crisis.

Our ranking member has been a leader on this issue, introducing amendments and standalone legislation to move the ball forward. Unfortunately, his ideas and the ideas of those on our side of the aisle and other constructive suggestions have not been included in this bill, making it a flawed bill. I urge my colleagues to oppose the legislation.

Ms. WATERS. Madam Speaker, I would inquire through the Chair if my

colleague has any remaining speakers on his side.

Mr. MCHENRY. Madam Speaker, I do.

Ms. WATERS. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCHENRY. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA), the ranking member of the Investor Protection, Entrepreneurship, and Capital Markets Subcommittee.

Mr. HUIZENGA. Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 5332, and it is not because I don't believe that there isn't a motive behind this that isn't intended to help consumers. I just don't think it is going to hit the target.

This bill requires the three largest nationwide credit reporting agencies to create a single shared online portal to allow consumers one-stop access to consumer reports, credit scores, and credit freezes, as well as to initiate disputes. This portal would contain information on consumer rights and directions on how to dispute a credit report.

The bill requires credit reporting agencies to match all nine digits of a consumer's Social Security number with the information included in a consumer file.

In addition, the bill codifies the CFPB's supervision of credit reporting agencies and expands their authority to establish ''administrative, technical, and physical safeguards,'' currently under the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act, to all credit reporting agencies.

The bill provides injunctive relief to allow a court to compel a credit reporting agency to fix an error or remove inaccurate information from a consumer report.

Furthermore, the bill creates an additional ombudsman at the CFPB tasked with resolving persistent errors on reports that are not addressed in a timely fashion and allows the ombudsman to make referrals to the Office of Supervision and Enforcement for corrective action.

We are all supportive of increased access and availability on credit reports, scores, and file freezes, but this legislation is just overly broad and proscriptive.

I, too, like one of my other colleagues who just talked about having mysterious things show up in the mail, have been a victim of that. I have also had my credit card numbers stolen in the past. We have had to be online and try to deal with these things.

The goal to make sure that we are all protected as much as possible is a lofty goal. The problem here, though, is that this is going to potentially decrease competition, which then actually disincentivizes that access; increasing fraud risk, which I am very concerned about; propping up the trial bar, which I know is a common theme here in Washington, D.C., at least out of one party; and expanding the authority of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau.

So, let's talk a little bit about the PII, that personally identifiable information. When you are matching all nine digits of consumers' Social Security numbers, it doesn't provide any alternate methods for verification. We have had problems with this in the past, and I, for one, and many Republicans have consistently—in fact, a number of my Democrat friends—have consistently expressed concerns regarding the private sector and government's overreliance on the use of these Social Security numbers for identity verification, which threatens consumers' personal information.

I oppose the Securities and Exchange Commission and other Federal agencies' use of PII in their databases because there have been breaches. I am reminded of the old adage: Why would you rob a bank? Because that is where the money is. Why would you go after a database? Because that is where the digital gold is.

What we are doing is, we are putting more digital gold into a new database. So we are increasing that vulnerability. We need to be working to promote more competition in the credit reporting and scoring industry, not less. I think that is what this bill, unfortunately, is doing.

Instead, we should be debating more targeted solutions, such as H.R. 3821, which would bolster cybersecurity capacity at credit reporting agencies, encourage an alternative to use of Social Security numbers, protect minors against fraud, and help consumers who may be facing medical debt as a result of the global pandemic.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to reject this bill.

Ms. WATERS. Madam Speaker, I reserve the right to close, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCHENRY. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to close.

Madam Speaker, as I said in my opening, this is yet another attempt by House Democrats to socialize the credit reporting and scoring industry.

We had an opportunity for a bipartisan bill, and this is not the work of that product. This bill will decrease competition in the industry, increase fraud risk related to consumers' personal data, prop up the trial bar, and expand the authority of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau.

If Congress really wants to protect consumers, we should be working together promote more competition in the credit reporting and scoring industry. We should be promoting new ways to eliminate the barriers to entry, not promoting what really comes down to less consumer choice.

We marked up this bill in the Financial Services Committee back in December. The committee Democrats noted in their report on the bill: ''It has been more than 15 years since Congress enacted comprehensive reform of the consumer credit reporting system, and there have been numerous shortcomings with the current system identified during that time that need to be addressed.''

Yet, since the Democrats took over in 2019, the House Financial Services Committee has held one hearing on credit reporting. We had a bipartisan consensus on the things that needed to be done and the challenges therein. This hearing featured a public grilling of the CEOs of the three nationwide bureaus. The hearing discussed structural problems within the industry, yet this bill just solidifies that structure.

The number one complaint in the CFPB consumer complaint database is about consumer issues with credit reporting.

Why are we reinforcing the current structure of this industry by legislating that? We should promote more competition in the system, not perpetuate an obviously broken one.

The Democrats took issue with the market failure in credit reporting, an issue we agree on. However, their legislative response does not do the things necessary to increase competition and consumer choice and protect our data.

The fact that Democrat leadership decided this bill was perfect and needed no amendments demonstrates my point. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle have no interest in working with Republicans to craft a bill that will really protect consumers' personal information. This bill is about catering to their stakeholders.

Madam Speaker, I will reiterate, like I have with so many bills that have passed the House: This bill has no chance of being passed by the Senate or signed into law.

Preserving access to and making available low-cost credit options to consumers should be Congress' priority. We should be working toward bipartisan solutions, and we should prioritize those things. We should be working toward those solutions, and that is why I urge a ''no'' vote on this bill.

Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD letters in opposition to this bill by the Consumer Data Industry Association, the Credit Union National Association, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the American Bankers Association, the National Taxpayers Union, and the Consumer Bankers Association.

CONSUMER DATA INDUSTRY ASSOCIATION,
Washington, DC, June 17, 2020.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI, Speaker,
Hon. KEVIN MCCARTHY, Republican Leader,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER PELOSI AND LEADER MCCARTHY: As the House prepares to consider HR 5332, the Protecting Your Credit Score Act of 2019, CDIA and its members wanted to take this opportunity to express our opposition to the bill.

We believe that this bill will have negative impacts on the American consumer. Over the last decade Congress has prioritized the ''ability to repay'' as the most important part of underwriting a financial product, to fight predatory lending and ensure that consumers are not able to borrow more than they can afford. This bill will make it harder

for lenders to determine whether a consumer has an ability to repay, increase loan losses and ultimately result in higher prices, especially for those who previously received the best prices on loan products after a lifetime of on-time payments.

The bill: could make the cost of borrowing more expensive and limit access to credit; could introduce new threats to consumers' information and physical security; and introduces unnecessary and expensive burdens into the credit reporting system, making it harder for consumers disputes to be processed in a timely fashion.

The bill could make the cost of borrowing more expensive and limit access to credit.

Section 4 of the bill could lead to higher costs of credit for the overall market, and specifically for consumers who pay their bills on time every month. This section of the bill would allow consumers who have not paid their bills on time to continue disputing information, even if the account is verified as accurate. This would increase the likelihood that that accurate, though negative information, will be excluded from credit scores, thereby impeding lenders from making adequate risk decisions.

This bill could introduce new threats to consumers' information and physical security.

Section 6 would require CRAs to effectively mail a credit report to a consumer every time an adverse action occurs in a credit transaction. If, for example, a consumer applies for a mortgage and receives a rate higher than the lowest possible rate due to the consumer's higher credit utilization rate, then each credit bureau would have to physically mail a report to the consumer, whether the consumer requested it or not. And if the consumer applied to several mortgage companies, the CRAs would have to mail the report to the consumer's last known address each time. This would create data security issues, as thousands of credit reports would be sent, by mail, to people who didn't ask for them, don't want them, or don't need them. Also, tens of millions of consumers move each year, increasing the likelihood that credit reports would fall into the hands of persons other than the intended consumer. Consumers today can receive free credit reports as often as every week and have additional opportunities to get their credit report under certain circumstances. CRAs should not be mailing millions of credit reports with very sensitive information to people who did not ask for them.

Section 2 of the bill could also harm consumers' personal physical security. This section includes language giving consumers new rights to opt out of sales of non-credit report information. The identity information that also appears in a credit report is critical for companies that need to confirm identity, alternate names, and previous addresses, such as criminal-background screeners. The effect of this provision would be to allow someone to hide their relevant criminal history from employers, volunteer agencies or other users of criminal history reports. For example, someone convicted of elder or child abuse could simply move to a new jurisdiction, opt out of non-credit report sales and apply for jobs with nursing homes or child-care centers. Today, when someone like this applies for a job and discloses neither their old address nor the criminal conviction, the background screener would purchase an address history from a credit bureau to identify jurisdictions in which to search for records. While this method is not fool proof, it is the industry standard and results in detection rates comparable to fingerprinting by the FBI. Without it, employers, volunteer agencies, youth sports leagues and other legitimate users of background screening would be at the mercy of any convicted criminal who is willing to lie on an application.

The bill introduces unnecessary and expensive burdens into the credit reporting system, making it harder for consumers disputes to be processed in a timely fashion.

The addition of a new ''consumer portal,'' also in Section 2, would create an unnecessary new government-mandated website for consumers when existing options for consumers already exist. Consumers currently can visit any of the websites of the nationwide CRAs and file a dispute, set a security freeze and exercise other rights that are guaranteed by the Fair Credit Reporting Act. This provision is unnecessary and could create additional data security issues.

Consumers who pay their bills on time would also be the ones most impacted by the bill's requirement for full nine-digit Social Security Number (SSN) matching. The FTC studied this matching topic in an exhaustive report directed by the 2003 FACT A Act, and found that matching nine digits of the SSN is not a viable solution, as it would not result in greater accuracy of credit reports, but it would lead to fewer consumers being approved for credit. By denying CRAs the ability to anticipate and fix transcription errors, consumers could end up having multiple fragmentary credit reports, each one tied to a given SSN. Then, when applying for new credit, a lender will not be able to see the full picture of the individual, meaning that the consumer who has paid their bills on time every month won't receive the benefit accrued during their many years of hard work. And some consumers will find strangers' files associated with their SSN, complicating the lending process. The Consumer Financial Protection Bureau supervises and examines the nationwide CRAs and has not raised this issue as a concern; this section of the bill will harm, not help, consumers.

We would also note that Section 5 of the bill includes injunctive relief that exposes users of credit reports to private enforcement for consumer notices and red flags. This would be a significant change in practice that would expose lenders to new liabilities from the trial bar.

This bill was the subject of a great deal of negotiation and discussion with Representative Gottheimer, the bill sponsor, before the Financial Services Committee passed the bill. We appreciate his spirit of cooperation, but unfortunately the bill before the House falls short of its goals to strengthen the consumer credit market and protect consumer credit scores.

Sincerely,

FRANCIS CREIGHTON,
President & CEO.

CREDIT UNION NATIONAL ASSOCIATION,
June 24, 2020.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.
Hon. KEVIN MCCARTHY,
Republican Leader, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER PELOSI AND LEADER MCCARTHY: On behalf of America's credit unions, I am writing regarding H.R. 5332, the Protecting Your Credit Score Act of 2019. The Credit Union National Association (CUNA) represents America's credit unions and their 115 million members.

Accurate and complete credit reports are essential to credit unions providing safe and affordable financial services to their members. Whereas credit unions' field of membership restrictions were originally designed as a mechanism for determining borrowers' credit worthiness, today credit unions and other financial institutions rely on credit reports and credit scores to assess credit worthiness and inform lending decisions. It is in the interest of all stakeholders in the lending process for borrowers' credit reports to be accurate and complete.

H.R. 5332 would require credit reporting agencies to create an online portal for consumers to access free credit reports and credit scores, and dispute errors. It would also direct the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau (CFPB) to impose and enforce data security safeguards for the credit reporting agencies.

While the legislation may be well-intentioned, we oppose H.R. 5332 because the expansion of private rights of action and allowing courts to award injunctive relief could increase the frequency of meritless lawsuits under the Federal Credit Reporting Act (FCRA). When entities are subject to frivolous litigation, resources are distracted from providing services, increasing the cost of service to all consumers. In the case of credit unions, frivolous litigation means that access to safe and affordable financial services becomes more expensive and potentially less available for credit union members.

We also have concerns that the online portal mandated under this legislation would pose significant cybersecurity risks for consumers, financial institutions, and companies. The portal created would have no direct owner and require its own authentication and security, leading to the possibility of consumers either being rejected from the portal or a nefarious actor abusing the system.

Finally, we question the need for this legislation. Under the FCRA, consumers can dispute the accurateness of information on their credit reports. They can either raise the dispute directly with the credit reporting agency or with their creditor. The FCRA requires these disputes to be resolved in a timely manner and, if the disputed information is incorrect, the information in question is eliminated from the report. As such, consumers already have significant tools to dispute information and correct errors in their credit reports.

On behalf of America's credit unions, thank you for the opportunity to share our views.

Sincerely,

JIM NUSSLE,
President & CEO.

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Washington, DC, June 23, 2020.

TO THE MEMBERS OF THE U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES: The U.S. Chamber of Commerce opposes H.R. 5332, the ''Protecting Your Credit Score Act of 2019.''

The Fair Credit Reporting Act (FCRA) requires each consumer reporting agency (CRA) to achieve maximum possible accuracy in compiling a consumer report. Every CRA also has a legal obligation to safeguard the personal information that they hold.

This legislation would require companies to jointly establish an online consumer portal with its own authentication and security, without a specific owner. This portal would create significant cybersecurity vulnerabilities for consumers and companies—making it impossible for CRAs to meet existing obligations. Further, the authentication of the portal could potentially expose credit reports to abusive credit repair. If the authentication is tuned too high, then real consumers would be rejected from the website. If authentication is too loose, then it could be abused.

The Chamber supports efforts to streamline access to credit data for consumers; however, it must be done in a responsible way that does not prevent access to credit. While we appreciate the extensive efforts of

Rep. Gottheimer to resolve our concerns, the Chamber remains opposed.

Sincerely,

NEIL L. BRADLEY.

AMERICAN BANKERS ASSOCIATION,
Washington, DC, June 23, 2020.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Hon. KEVIN MCCARTHY,
Minority Leader, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER PELOSI AND MINORITY LEADER MCCARTHY: The American Bankers Association writes to express our opposition to H.R. 5332, the Protecting Your Credit Score Act of 2020, scheduled for consideration before the House this week.

We share the sponsor's interest in ensuring that credit reports are complete and accurate and that consumers have appropriate protections, including rights to challenge and have corrected any inaccuracies in their reports. Though the legislation is well-intended, we believe it will make credit reports less predictive and useful by promoting the elimination of negative but accurate information that will weaken the underwriting process and thus increase borrowers' costs and reduce people's ability to get loans. In addition, allowing courts to award injunctive relief will promote questionable lawsuits and replace the current single-interpretation regime with inconsistent interpretations that vary across the country.

The Fair Credit Reporting Act (FCRA) currently provides consumers strong dispute rights to challenge the accuracy of information in their reports—rights that are enforced through supervision, government agency enforcement actions, and civil lawsuits. Consumers may submit claims to either the consumer reporting agency or directly to the furnisher of the information. Disputes must be investigated and resolved promptly. If not, the information is deleted. Thus, consumers have ample legal means to challenge the accuracy of information in their credit reports.

We are concerned about the abuse of these protective provisions to remove accurate but negative information, not only by credit repair organizations and those hoping to erase accurate negative information from their report to improve their ability to obtain credit, but also by individuals, including those involved in organized crime, seeking to defraud lenders.

H.R. 5332 will make it even easier than it is today for individuals to flood consumer reporting agencies and furnishers of information with false claims of inaccuracies that must be resolved in a timely fashion or deleted. The resulting degradation of the reports will reduce the ability of lenders to evaluate an applicant's creditworthiness and ability to repay, which in turn will increase what consumers pay for credit and make it harder for many consumers, especially the underserved, to get credit. Moreover, resources and money spent to manage the increased volume of false claims are better spent resolving legitimate disputes.

The bill will further undermine the consumer reporting system by expanding private rights of action against users of credit reports and by creating uncertainty about how banks and others must comply with the FCRA. Allowing courts to award injunctive relief means that multiple courts can interpret this complicated statute differently from the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, the primary agency tasked with interpreting and enforcing FCRA. The result will be a patchwork of inconsistent interpretations, uncertainty about how to comply, and lawsuits of questionable merit.

While we appreciate Representative Gottheimer's efforts and welcome discussion on these issues, we must oppose H.R. 5332 as currently crafted.

Sincerely,

JAMES C. BALLENTINE.

NATIONAL TAXPAYERS UNION,
Washington. DC, June 26, 2020.

The National Taxpayers Union urges Representatives to vote ''NO'' on H.R. 5332, the ''Protecting Your Credit Score Act of 2020.'' Though well-intentioned, this legislation would cede more power to the unaccountable Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, jeopardize consumer information, and potentially weaken lending underwriting standards.

Accurate and complete credit reports are the foundation of this country's robust and competitive consumer credit market. Most, if not all, lenders rely upon credit history data found in credit reports to identify and evaluate potential risks a consumer may pose before entering into a financial relationship with that consumer. That information is critical for lenders to evaluate the applicant's ability to repay, interest rates, and other loan terms. Since many home loan borrowers will have their mortgage guaranteed by the federal government, lawmakers must be cautious in their reforms to the Fair Credit Reporting Act (FCRA) to avoid adding undue credit risk onto the government-sponsored enterprises' balance sheets.

Perhaps the most problematic provision of H.R. 5332 is the requirement for the three major credit bureaus, which are entirely private businesses, to jointly create an online consumer portal for consumers to access their credit reports and scores, dispute errors, and place or lift security freezes. While a one-stop shop may seem to offer consumer benefits, having one location containing every credit report, personal information, and social security number of every individual could have disastrous consequences in the event of a cyber hack or data breach.

Secondly, this legislation provides no legal protection to these entities in the event of a large scale cyber breach, leaving these businesses vulnerable to big class-action lawsuits. H.R. 5332 also changes how consumers dispute adverse information found in their credit reports, allowing individuals to flood reporting agencies and lenders with false claims of inaccuracies that must be resolved in a timely manner. Ultimately, this proposal shifts the burden on dispute resolution from the individual onto the credit bureaus.

Additionally, this bill establishes a second, duplicative ombudsman at the CFPB who will have sole control over credit reporting. The ombudsperson would have to help resolve persistent errors in credit reports that aren't addressed in a timely manner, and make referrals for supervisory or enforcement actions against credit reporting companies. This situation sets up a new opportunity for the CFPB to specifically target certain companies that may become ''unsavory'' and be subject to political targeting.

NTU also questions the need for such legislation, as the FCRA currently provides consumers ample opportunity to dispute inaccurate information on their credit reports. The FCRA already requires these disputes to be resolved in a timely manner and, if the disputed information is incorrect, the information in question is eliminated from a report. In essence, this legislation does not bring any new meaningful benefits to the credit reporting process.

Roll call votes on H.R. 5332 will be included in NTU's annual Rating of Congress and a ''NO'' vote will be considered the pro-taxpayer position. If you have any questions, please contact NTU Policy and Government Affairs Manager, Thomas Aiello.

CONSUMER BANKERS ASSOCIATION,
Washington, DC, June 25, 2020.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House,
Washington, DC.

Hon. KEVIN MCCARTHY,
House Minority Leader,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER PELOSI AND LEADER MCCARTHY: On behalf of the Consumer Bankers Association (CBA), I am writing to share our views on H.R. 5332, the Protecting Your Credit Score Act of 2019. CBA is the voice of the retail banking industry whose products and services provide access to credit for consumers and small businesses. Our members operate in all 50 states, serve more than 150 million Americans, and collectively hold two-thirds of the country's total depository assets.

CBA opposes the Protecting Your Credit Score Act of 2019. Section 5 of the bill, ''Injunctive Relief for Victims,'' is especially concerning because it undermines the CFPB and Federal Trade Commission's (FTC) primary authority to enforce the Fair Credit Reporting Act (FCRA) in a manner consistent with maintaining a nationwide credit reporting system that benefits businesses and consumers. Congress enacted FCRA in 1970 with emphasis on ensuring fairness, accuracy, and efficiency within the banking system, and in doing so specifically protected federal regulators' sole authority to pursue injunctive relief for violations, to avoid any possibility of multiple courts issuing conflicting orders. Undoing this deliberate design is unnecessary given the serious fines and other existing penalties already in place under the FCRA and court disrupt credit markets without any positive impact on consumer credit reports. As depository institutions supervised by prudential federal regulators with deep expertise and experience in financial markets, CBA members are concerned with the potential for unlimited injunctive authority to impair nationwide financial systems.

CBA is also troubled by Section 4, ''Improved Dispute Process for Consumer Reporting Agencies.'' The CFPB already has authority to enforce fines for FCRA violations, and this proposal would complicate existing cost effective and efficient processes furnishers are mandated to use under federal law to distinguish false or illegitimate disputes from actual consumer problems that should draw focus and proper inquiry. Safety and soundness considerations require the highest standards for complete and accurate consumer information in the underwriting process. Modifying or deleting disagreeable, but accurate consumer information from any report without proper input from furnishers will interfere with prudent risk assessments and raise costs for all consumers.

Furthermore, the ''Bureau Credit Reporting Ombudsman'' as written under this section has seemingly unrestrained individual authority that could make determinations on a consumer's credit profile without the due process or appeal mechanisms generally required under the Administrative Procedure Act (APA). This unilateral decision-making authority would have a serious and negative impact on a bank's ability to determine risk and extend affordable credit.

Thank you for your consideration of our views. CBA remains eager to assist your efforts at improving outcomes for all borrowers.

Sincerely,

RICHARD HUNT,
President and CEO.

Mr. MCHENRY. Madam Speaker, I urge a ''no'' vote on this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. WATERS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Speaker, it has been nearly 17 years since major reform legislation to address common problems with credit reporting has been enacted into law. To that end, I am pleased that, earlier this year, the House passed H.R. 3621, the Comprehensive Credit Reporting Enhancement, Disclosure, Innovation, and Transparency Act.

Representative GOTTHEIMER's bipartisan bill complements those efforts to ensure we have a well-functioning credit reporting system that is streamlined and easy to use and that better protects the data of all consumers.

Republicans were in charge when Equifax exposed sensitive data of 150 million Americans. What was their response? Nothing.

Earlier this year, the House passed the Comprehensive CREDIT Act to overhaul our broken credit reporting system and enhance cybersecurity of the credit reporting bureaus. Republicans voted no.

Representative GOTTHEIMER offered this bill that would strengthen cybersecurity of Equifax and other credit bureaus, and now Republicans are saying no.

We have some Republicans who oppose giving the CFPB expanded authority, although I would note Ranking Member MCHENRY introduced H.R. 3821 that would do just that, giving the CFPB authority of cybersecurity for the credit bureaus. The bill before us would do the same.

I would urge Republicans to reconsider their opposition to the bill. I urge an ''aye'' vote on this commonsense bill.

Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD support for this bill from the Americans for Financial Reform, the National Consumer Law Center, Consumer Action, Consumer Federation of America, Consumer Reports, National Association of Consumer Advocates, World Privacy Forum, and also the National Association of Realtors.

JUNE 23, 2020.

DEAR CHAIRWOMAN WATERS: The undersigned consumer organizations write to support H.R. 5332, the Protecting Your Credit Score Act of 2019 (Gottheimer). This bill will address serious problems in the credit reporting system and empower consumers by providing them with much greater access to and control over their own information.

Credit reports and credit scores play a huge role in determining a consumer's financial health. Not only do they determine a consumer's ability to obtain credit at a fair price, but they are used by many other sectors—insurance companies, landlords and even employers. Despite their importance, credit reports are also full of errors, which can cost a consumer thousands of dollars in higher-priced credit, or worse yet, result in the denial of a job, insurance coverage, an apartment rental, or the ability to open a small business or buy a house. The Federal Trade Commission's definitive study showed that 21% of consumers had verified errors in their credit reports, 13% had errors that affected their credit scores, and 5% had errors serious enough to cause them to be denied or pay more for credit.

Trying to fix these errors can be a Kafkaesque nightmare in which the Big Three nationwide consumer reporting agencies (CRAs)—Equifax, Experian and TransUnion—consistently favor the side of the creditor or debt collector (''the furnisher'') over the consumer. As documented in NCLC's report Automated lniustice Redux (2019), some of the most serious problems include consumers having their credit files ''mixed'' with the wrong person, being unable to remove negative information even after court judgments in their favor, the after-effects of identity theft when CRAs don't believe the victim, and being labeled as dead when they are alive and breathing. The report also documents the massive number of credit and consumer reporting complaints to the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau (CFPB), over 380,000 since July 2011, which is often the top category of complaints to the CFPB.

The irony of these problems is that credit reports consist of our information. Yet consumers are only entitled to free access to this information once a year and in certain other limited situations, despite the fact that the Big Three nationwide CRAs are making tens of millions selling our financial data. Also, consumers are not entitled to our own credit scores for free, while these same scores are being sold to creditors and others for hefty profits.

Last, but not least, there are serious issues with data security at the nationwide CRAs, of the type that led to the massive Equifax data breach in 2017. These data security issues have not yet been adequately addressed.

The Protecting Your Credit Score Act of 2019 would address these issues by:

Fixing the broken system for credit reporting disputes by (1) creating a CFPB ombudsperson that will have the power to resolve persistent errors when CRAs don't fix them properly, and to make referrels to the Office of Supervision or the Office of Enforcement for supevisory or enforcement action when CRAs don't comply with their disput investigation reponsibilities and (2) requiring CRAs to dedicate sufficient resources and provide proper training to personnel who handle disputes.

Giving consumers the tools they need to access their rights, understand their creditworthiness, and control their financial destinies by (1) giving consumers the right to unlimited free credit reports and free credit scores online; (2) requiring the Big Three nationwide CRAs to create a simple, easy-to-use portal tool to access online credit reports and credit scores, as well to exercise other important rights such as placing a security freeze, initiating a dispute, and opting out of prescreening (*i.e.*, the use of credit report information to generate offers of credit).

Improving credit reporting accuracy by (2) requiring CRAs to conduct periodic audits to check for accuracy and (2) mandating that Big Three nationwide CRAs use all 9 digits of the consumer's Social Security number when matching information from a lender to a consumer's file, thus preventing mixed files, which are one of the worst types of errors.

Improving data security for credit reports by giving the CFPB the authority to write rules under the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act to govern the Big Three nationwide CRAs.

Give consumers a tool to compel CRAs to fix a credit report by providing them with a right to seek injunctive relief so that a court could order a CRA to correct an error or otherwise follow the law.

There are a number of other important reforms in the bill, such as giving consumers the right to opt out of the selling or sharing of information about them that does not fall into the FCRA's current definition of ''consumer report'' and creating a comprehensive registry of all consumer reporting agencies.

The above reforms are urgently needed in order to ensure that consumers are treated fairly by the credit reporting system and that they have the access and control that they should be entitled to. Thus, we support the Protecting Your Credit Score Act of 2019 an look forward to working with you to swiftly enact it into law.

Thank you for your attention. If you have any questions about this letter, please contact Chi Chi Wu (cwu@nclc.org) at (617) 542–8010.

Sincerely,

AMERICANS FOR FINANCIAL REFORM,
NATIONAL CONSUMER LAW CENTER (on behalf of its low-income clients),
CONSUMER ACTION,
CONSUMER FEDERATION OF AMERICA,
CONSUMER REPORTS,
NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF CONSUMER ADVOCATES,
USPIRG,
WORLD PRIVACY FORUM.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF REALTORS,
Washington, DC, June 23, 2020.

Hon. JOSH GOTTHEIMER,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE GOTTHEIMER: On behalf of the 1.4 million members of the National Association of REALTORS® (NAR), I am pleased to support several provisions of H.R. 5332, the Protecting Your Credit Score Act of 2020.

NAR has a long history of involvement in issues concerning the use and disclosure of consumer credit data. Nearly 90 percent of home sales are financed, and a borrower's credit report and credit score form a critical gateway to obtaining a mortgage. Unfortunately, inaccurate credit reports and unfair credit reporting methods raise the cost to borrow and/or limit access to mortgage credit for many prospective borrowers.

REALTORS® believe that access to free credit scores, transparency in the reporting process and use of consumer credit information, high standards for vetting credit information, and a reliable method for contesting and correcting inaccurate information are critical to a vibrant housing market and economy. To this end, NAR applauds your efforts in H.R. 5332, the Protecting Your Credit Score Act of 2020. We are particularly supportive of sections two through six, which reflect NAR's principles on credit reporting. While NAR has no position on the primary regulator of the CRAs, we appreciate your efforts in clarifying that important point.

Creditor and consumer confidence are critical in the home financing process, and our nation's housing market and overall economy benefit tremendously from balanced financial regulation and appropriate consumer protection. REALTORS® thank you for your diligent work to improve the accuracy and accountability of consumer credit information.

Sincerely,

VINCE MALTA,
2020 President, National Association of REALTORS®.

Ms. WATERS. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 1017, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of H.R. 5332 is postponed.

□ 1615

PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF RULE SUBMITTED BY OFFICE OF THE COMPTROLLER OF THE CURRENCY RELATING TO ''COMMUNITY REINVESTMENT ACT REGULATIONS''

Ms. WATERS. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1017, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 90) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency relating to ''Community Reinvestment Act Regulations'', and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1017, the joint resolution is considered read.

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

H.J. RES. 90

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Congress disapproves the rule submitted by the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency relating to ''Community Reinvestment Act Regulations'' (85 Fed. Reg. 34734; published June 5, 2020), and such rule shall have no force or effect.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The joint resolution shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services.

The gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. WATERS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.J. Res. 90 and to insert extraneous material thereon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Ms. WATERS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.J. Res. 90, a Congressional Review Act resolution of disapproval to nullify the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency's rule undermining the Community Reinvestment Act.

I introduced this resolution with our Consumer Protection and Financial Institutions Subcommittee chair, Representative MEEKS, and I am proud we are joined by 70 other Members who have cosponsored the resolution.

The Community Reinvestment Act is a civil rights act. It is a law enacted in 1977 to prevent the discriminatory practice of redlining, in which banks discriminate against prospective customers in nearby neighborhoods, often based on their racial or ethnic background. The law requires banks to invest and lend responsibly in low- and moderate-income communities where they are chartered.

Unfortunately, implementation of the Community Reinvestment Act has not been robust. Today, 98 percent of the banks routinely pass their Community Reinvestment Act exams. However, research has shown that more than 60 metro areas across the country are now experiencing modern-day redlining today. These findings clearly demonstrate the need to strengthen the implementation of the law. Unfortunately, the OCC's rule would do the opposite.

Despite the warnings of a wide range of stakeholders, former Comptroller Otting rushed to finalize this rule in his final days on the job. So, without the support—without the support—of the Federal Reserve or the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the other banking regulators were responsible for enforcing the law.

Mr. Otting appears to have been determined to undermine the Community Reinvestment Act ever since the law complicated his efforts to quickly obtain regulatory approval for OneWest Bank, a bank that he ran with Treasury Secretary Mnuchin, to merge with another bank in 2015.

I am deeply concerned that the OCC's final rule will harm low-income and minority communities that are disproportionately suffering during this crisis, effectively turning the Community Reinvestment Act into the community disinvestment act.

If this resolution is not adopted, we will have different rules for different banks, leading to regulatory arbitrage and a race to the bottom of weaker standards that will only hurt the people the law is intended to help.

Notably, the OCC rule was adopted with insufficient and incomplete data, and it incentivizes large deals at the expense of smaller and more continuous financial transactions that truly benefit LMI communities.

For example, the OCC final rule allows CRA credit to be given for activities in LMI-qualified opportunity zones, but the rule does not ensure that these activities promote community development that includes affordable housing or small business economic development. This can lead to the unacceptable result of banks receiving CRA funding for building luxury housing in opportunity zones, providing no direct benefit to LMI communities.

Additionally, the OCC concedes it does not have all the data it needs to properly implement its new CRA framework, with the rules stating that the OCC will need to issue yet another notice of proposed rulemaking in the future to help set specific benchmarks, thresholds, and minimums. It doesn't speak highly of a rule when the office says it is half baked.

A wide range of stakeholders have criticized OCC's efforts. For example, a group of civil rights and consumer groups issued a statement noting: ''The new OCC rules stick with an overly simplistic metrics system that creates a loophole for banks to exploit, allowing them to get a passing CRA rating by making investments in communities where they can reap the largest rewards, while leaving too many credit needs unmet for underserved consumers and neighbors.''

During these difficult times, communities across the country have taken to the streets to demand justice and to tell their elected officials that they can no longer ignore the needs of communities of color. In a letter supporting this resolution from various organizations led by the Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights and National Community Reinvestment Coalition, they wrote: ''In the weeks since the OCC finalized its rule, our Nation has been facing a long overdue reckoning with our troubled legacy of racial and ethnic discrimination. . . . Now is certainly not the time to weaken the most important civil rights laws we have at our disposal to correct those disparities.''

Congress must block any effort by the Trump administration to weaken our civil rights laws and send a strong message to Federal regulators that they should be doing all they can during this pandemic to help, not hurt, low- and moderate-income communities, and especially communities of color.

By passing this resolution, Congress will block the OCC's harmful rule so that, once the pandemic passes, banking regulators can renew efforts to collaborate, modernize, and strengthen the Community Reinvestment Act with a new joint rulemaking that truly benefits the community the law was intended to help.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues in the House to vote ''yes'' on H.J. Res. 90.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCHENRY. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I rise in opposition to the resolution.

Madam Speaker, as I said, I rise in opposition to this resolution. First, before I get into the contents of my discussion here, I want to thank Chairwoman WATERS for her steadfast and long-time leadership in supporting minority, rural, low- and middle-income communities, LMI communities. Her service in the California Assembly and Senate and Congress has been commensurate with that work and that focus.

Committee Republicans share the chairwoman's goal of strengthening

these communities. For example, we know that community development financial institutions and minority depository institutions play critical roles in getting necessary funds to the smallest of small businesses in these communities.

Committee Republicans support the efforts of the Paycheck Protection Program to target small lenders as well as small businesses in communities across America.

Committee Republicans believe the reforms made in the underlying final rule promulgated by the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency will continue to support minority, rural, and LMI communities into the 21st century.

Madam Speaker, the Community Reinvestment Act was enacted in 1977, nearly 43 years ago. Its purpose was to ensure depository institutions like banks and savings associations help meet the needs of their local communities. The law tasks the OCC, as well as the other bank regulators, with issuing rules to carry out that purpose. However, the last time the CRA regulations were meaningfully updated was in 1995.

I think we can all agree that a lot has changed in the past 25 years, including how banks can best serve their communities. Much of this change has been driven by technology and innovation.

In 1995, it was cutting edge when you could call your bank and get your balance and the last couple of checks that cleared your account. Calling up and not having to talk with somebody and a computer tell you the answer, that was cutting edge. And at that time, only 24 percent of Americans had accessed the internet.

Since that time, we have witnessed a massive shift to online and mobile delivery of banking services, and that is for good in many, many ways. This virus has really enhanced that trend just in the last few months. This means that where banks get their deposits doesn't necessarily match up with where their branches are physically located.

Second, the number of bank branches has steadily declined since the financial crisis, but the CRA regulations continue to place a very heavy emphasis on banks' physical footprints rather than where they truly serve.

At the same time, CRA exams have gotten more complex and less transparent. Banks can only guess which of their community investments will receive credit, because the exams are quite highly subjective. The written evaluations can be thousands of pages long, and yet the regulators and the public have no clear data to help understand where all the CRA money has gone.

But there are, sadly, a few things that have not changed in the last 25 years—sadly—including socioeconomic conditions in the poorest communities, economic opportunity, and the persistent lack of capital in those communities. The CRA is intended to help address those issues, and that is why it is a vital and important law and, properly structured, can deliver in a better way.

But, clearly, we know the status quo is not working. It is not working for the communities that we care desperately about giving opportunity to, economic opportunity to, and that is really what this is driven towards with this law.

Modernizing this regulatory framework is long overdue. Here are a few aspects of the rule that I believe represent major improvements over the old regulations.

First, the rule provides for a public list of activities that will count for CRA credit so the community can understand, the banks can understand, and we, as elected officials who have oversight of this program, we can understand, too. And they will have that public list on what counts for CRA credit.

This list will eliminate regulatory ambiguity and provide certainty over the types of investments that will lead to a good evaluation. With more certainly, banks will naturally make more investments. That is how capitalism works. This change alone is likely to increase community reinvestment across the board.

Second, the rule provides a better model for where the activity can count. Banks will be incentivized to invest where they take deposits instead of only around their branches. Let me explain.

Previously, a bank was only evaluated on its lending and investment in an area around its physical footprint, but banking today is very different than it was a generation ago when this regulation was written. Banking today, with the help of new technology and innovation has changed substantially. So, if an online bank chooses a headquarters in one State—let me give you an example: Utah.

Utah has a lot of online banks and they domicile in Salt Lake City, so that is where the community giving is around Salt Lake City, even if they take most of their deposits from Chairwoman WATERS' district or my district. So, if you have that headquarters for an online bank, it should not prevent them from making investments in other States or localities that desperately need capital.

Under the final rule, banks will get credit for investing in so-called banking deserts. This has been a priority of mine for the last decade, to help those who are in communities where they can't get ready access. We know food deserts in urban areas, and if you can't get access to fresh food, you can't have a healthy diet.

□ 1630

That is a huge issue. It is a huge issue in rural areas, it is a huge issue in urban areas.

So we have banking deserts now, and this rule prioritizes those banking deserts that don't have a branch or don't have many branches. And those underserved places under this rule are distressed areas, economically distressed areas, Tribal lands, folks that have been hit by natural disasters, regardless of where they get deposits or if they get deposits from those areas. I think there are some laudable changes.

Now communities without bank branches that were essentially invisible under the current framework will be able to receive CRA investment. This is a huge improvement.

Finally, the rule introduces objective metrics and transparent evaluations. I think that is a really good thing for regulation. Instead of a highly subjective exam and a 1,000-page evaluation, examiners will be able to deliver more consistent, useful, and timely CRA evaluations; ''timely'' meaning more frequent and more readily available.

Clearer metrics and better reporting will enable banks, regulators, and the public to have a better understanding of the CRA activities of individual banks and of cross-sections of the industry. Consumers will be able to see that and understand the type of institution they are banking with as well.

I would also note that this final rule is a culmination of a multiyear process. It reflects more than a decade of dialogue about how to make the CRA work better, it builds on recommendations that Federal banking agencies submitted to Congress in 2017 and recommendations released by the Treasury Department in April of 2018 and more than 75 hard comments submitted during the rulemaking process that updated and changed and made better the regulations that the administration put forward.

Republicans and Democrats agree the Community Reinvestment Act is extremely important, it is an important law. And because it is important, the regulations need to keep pace with how Americans bank today.

I believe this rule is a huge improvement over the status quo.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote against this resolution and support the underlying rule.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. WATERS. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS), who is the chairman of the Subcommittee on Consumer Protection and Financial Institutions and the coauthor of this bill.

Mr. MEEKS. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.J. Res. 90, and I am proud to have joined Chairwoman WATERS in introducing it.

This resolution provides for congressional disapproval of the rule submitted by the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency relating to the Community Reinvestment Act.

The Community Reinvestment Act was enacted into law, as indicated, in 1977 as a direct response to the long, painful legacy of structural discrimination, financial exclusion, redlining, and

economic suppression of racial minorities in America, a legacy of prejudice and economic exclusion that we are seeing all-too-clearly still echoes to this day, which is why many of the individuals you see in the streets today want to correct this structural problem that we have in our Nation.

At its core, the Community Reinvestment Act is a civil rights bill. It was the fourth in a series of banking bills passed to address systemic discrimination in banking, including the Fair Housing Act of 1968, the Equal Credit Opportunity Act of 1974, and the Home Mortgage Disclosure Act of 1975.

These bills built on the findings of the 1961 report from the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, and community-led civil action in Chicago to hold banks accountable for rampant discrimination in lending in Black and Hispanic communities.

Any efforts at reforms and modernization must remain true to this legacy, particularly given the overwhelming evidence of continued discrimination in banking and access to finance.

We must make sure that when we look at the CRA, the CRA is creating an opportunity for minority businesses to thrive and strive and investing further in its communities; that affordable housing is something that is there, not something where we are investing and driving people out so they can't have the benefits in the community. It must be relevant to the community and keeping the people in the community so that they can see a better life.

Under Comptroller Otting's leadership, the OCC's work on CRA modernization has systematically failed to remain true to the law's civil rights roots. In fact, the very way in which the rule was finalized and published by the OCC was symptomatic of the agency's failed approach from the start. It was rushed, unfinished, unsupported by data, and not done in coordination with the other prudential regulators.

And to cap it all off, Comptroller Otting abandoned his post within the very same week of publishing this rule, in the middle of a pandemic, economic crisis, and a looming banking crisis, leaving everyone else to hold the bag.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. WATERS. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. MEEKS. Madam Speaker, the fact is, there is room to modernize CRA and to update it to the realities of modern-day banking. The Fed and community advocacy groups have put forward some thoughtful ideas on just how to do that.

Let us pass this bill, let us stop this ill-fated rule that the OCC put out, and let us do some real CRA to help people in these communities who have been deprived for far too long.

Mr. MCHENRY. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TIPTON), a great member from the Financial Services Committee who also is the vice chair of the Western Caucus.

Mr. TIPTON. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise in opposition to the resolution on the floor today.

We agree that the Community Reinvestment Act is an important historic piece of legislation; however, my friends across the aisle have mischaracterized the OCC's rule and the modernization of the CRA.

First, the OCC's rulemaking process has been thorough, inclusive, and thoughtful. CRA regulations haven't been meaningfully updated since 1995, making this a much-needed effort to ensure that regulations match the modern state of the banking industry.

The OCC's processes included input from the Federal Reserve, the FDIC, the Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council, and the Treasury Department.

The OCC has also provided ample opportunities for regulated banks and consumer groups to weigh in.

What is more, 94 percent of the participants in the OCC's advance notice of proposed rulemaking agreed that the current CRA rules lack objectivity, transparency, and fairness. These are the central themes to the OCC's modernization effort.

Second, this update to the CRA is needed now more than ever. One large bank's CEO recently noted that due to COVID–19, the bank has seen somewhere between a 17 and 35 percent increase in online banking activity that normally would have been conducted in the branch. Americans are turning to online banking resources now more than ever.

The OCC's rule takes steps to be able to ensure that CRA dollars go into low-to-moderate income communities where banks draw their deposits, not only where they have bank branches. This change is forward-looking and should mark significant new opportunities to be able to invest in underserved communities.

Third, the OCC regularly and meaningfully engaged with critics in the rulemaking process. The OCC met with community, consumer, and academic groups to listen to their concerns about the proposal.

These meetings resulted in real changes to the OCC's final rule, including a raised exemption threshold for community banks, changes to the treatment of mortgage origination and sale on the secondary market for purposes of the CRA, and raising the bar for a passing grade in CRA examinations.

This rule creates greater accountability between banks and the communities they invest in under the CRA. It adds transparency in what activity counts towards CRA credit, creates fairer and more timely examinations, and allows CRA performances to be measured assessment over assessment and against other banks. It also allows banks to reach new constituencies with their CRA dollars, most notably disabled, Tribal, rural, and farm populations.

By increasing regulatory certainty and reducing subjectivity, the OCC CRA modernization rule can equal greater lending and investment in underserved communities.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the measure.

Ms. WATERS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, it is an honor to serve in the Congress of the United States of America under Chairwoman WATERS' leadership.

Madam Speaker, Ms. WATERS and I both know that the CRA was not born to create luxury homes in opportunity zones. The CRA was not birthed to provide opportunities in what are being called banking deserts that may not be LMI communities.

The CRA was born to correct the harm that the government had done in the 1930s.

At that time, the government, by and through the FHA, decided that it would craft maps, and these maps had red lines on them. These red lines became communities that were undesirable, but more appropriately, they were deemed unsafe, and as a result, lending institutions would not lend in these redlined areas.

The CRA was born to end the discrimination, the redlining, but this bill takes a step back to the 1930s.

This bill will not undo the harm that was done; it will increase the harm. I cannot support it.

The CRA was created to help LMI, low-to-moderate income, communities have banking privileges that they were denied under the law.

This bill doesn't help us with the LMIs. It is going to give those big guys an opportunity to acquire these funds. I stand against it.

Madam Speaker, I support the chair of the committee and I stand for justice for the LMI communities.

Mr. MCHENRY. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA), my friend and the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Investor Protection, Entrepreneurship, and Capital Markets.

Mr. HUIZENGA. Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.J. Res. 90, which is an effort to overturn a long-overdue regulatory update of the Community Reinvestment Act.

Frankly, it is ludicrous to compare this modernization effort to bringing us back to 1930s banking policy. I don't understand how my colleagues on the other side can possibly equate that.

So we all agree the fundamental purpose of the Community Reinvestment Act is to combat unacceptable, discriminatory redlining, and demand that banks meet the credit needs of

their communities. There is no disagreement on that. My friend from New York laid out that history very, very well. It is the reason why we support the CRA and modernizing it.

However, the regulations promulgated to implement the CRA haven't been meaningfully updated since 1995. Now, earlier we were talking about credit reporting, and the chair cited the fact that we had not addressed this in 17 years, as to why we needed to pass the bill that was on the floor. Well, we haven't addressed the CRA in any meaningful way for 25 years. We have 8 years on that on this particular issue.

So in May of this year, the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency issued a final rule that modernizes the Community Reinvestment Act regulations for the 21st century.

The final rule provides clarity to banks on what activities count for a Community Reinvestment Credit, updated the geographic definitions of a bank's community, as well as accounts for the technological transformation of banking services that we have seen. This will ensure that banks' reinvestment will be in those communities that need it most.

The final rule establishes new performance standards and metrics that will allow OCC bank examiners to measure performance objectively and produce more consistent, useful, and timely Community Reinvestment Act evaluations to provide more clarity to banks.

Now, I understand that some of my colleagues want to have this ''let's move the target to my pet project'' kind of a way of evaluating where a bank is going, but that is not what it is intended to do.

Lastly, this modernization introduces objective reporting measures that will allow comparison over time and between banks, which has never been possible in the history of the CRA. What is a good project in one neighborhood should be viewed as a good project in an adjacent neighborhood, and that isn't the case today.

□ 1645

As we work to ensure a strong economic recovery for all Americans—all Americans—it is critical that we encourage financial institutions to continue to provide services to those most in need.

I have the poorest county in the State of Michigan. I have urban and suburban areas. These are issues that affect all of America.

The OCC's rule will play an important role in this recovery effort by encouraging more capital, investment, and lending services in the communities hardest hit by COVID–19.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MCHENRY. Madam Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Michigan an additional 1 minute.

Mr. HUIZENGA. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the ranking member doing that. Let me just wrap up.

By using the Congressional Review Act to overturn this critical final rule, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle will only delay progress and harm the very communities that I know they want to protect. Those are the same communities that I serve as well.

I urge all of my colleagues to vote against this partisan attempt to overturn much-needed reform and modernization of the Community Reinvestment Act, and I am hopeful that we are going to be able to come together and work on true, meaningful, actual reform in the long run.

Ms. WATERS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HECK), a senior member of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. HECK. Madam Speaker, I thank the chairwoman for introducing this important measure, of which I am a proud cosponsor.

This resolution is especially timely as we reckon with the legacy of discrimination in our country. In that process, we must consider how housing policy has contributed to systemic inequality.

For decades in this country, we allowed a Federal agency to legitimize racial discrimination by creating those color-coded maps indicating where investments would be profitable, ''greenlined,'' or where it would not be, ''redlined.''

We built institutional obstacles for Black families trying to purchase a home, and that resulted in devastating, intergenerational financial disadvantages.

Redlining prevented access to the single most important wealth-building tool an American has access to, that is, owning a home. The result? Black families have a median net worth of $17,000, compared to $171,000 for White families. In fact, homeownership by Black families is 44 percent, and by White families, 74 percent.

We have a responsibility to do everything we can to correct this. After all, we created it.

Yet, in the middle of a pandemic that has made racial disparities all the more pronounced, the OCC rushed out a final rule that undermined the legislation that made redlining illegal, and they even did it without the support of the Federal Reserve or FDIC.

The OCC's vague definitions and overly simplistic metrics do not do justice to what a crucial role homeownership and housing policy have played in racial inequality.

Their approach takes us backward. If you don't want to go backward, vote ''yes'' on this measure. If you believe homeownership should be available to all Americans, regardless of skin color, vote ''yes'' on this matter. If you oppose redlining, vote ''yes'' on this measure. If you want to stand for racial justice, vote ''yes'' on this measure.

Mr. MCHENRY. Madam Speaker, I would just note for the RECORD that the FDIC approved just this week this rule, the CRA, so that is, in fact, they actually support this underlying rule.

Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Little Rock, Arkansas (Mr. HILL), my colleague and friend, the ranking member of the National Security, International Development and Monetary Policy Subcommittee.

Mr. HILL of Arkansas. Madam Speaker, I thank the ranking member for the time.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.J. Res. 90, but I rise in support of the Community Reinvestment Act. And I rise in support of the goal of CRA, for a fair and more equitable treatment of financial investment, particularly in low- and moderate-income areas of our communities.

This resolution overturns the updated Community Reinvestment Act regulation before it has even had a chance to take effect.

Speaking purely from a procedural standpoint, this resolution, in my view, Madam Speaker, is not necessary. We could be spending time on the House floor today in a much more productive way to advance the economy.

The Office of the Comptroller of the Currency has gone through a rigorous Administrative Procedure Act process. I think our constituents should know they have conducted outreach since 2017, 3 years, and have taken all that into consideration, the Federal Reserve data, Treasury recommendations, and have conducted both advanced notice for proposed rulemaking and a notice of proposed rulemaking, and received 7,500 comments.

The final rule ended up incorporating much of this serious and constructive criticism received from all stakeholders, notably, our community groups.

Banks have been complying with the Community Reinvestment Act for years. This is not a new rule, Madam Speaker. This rule is simply being updated to reflect the current economic and banking conditions in our country. The last time that was updated was 1995.

Working for a publicly traded bank in Arkansas then, I was involved in the training and the implementation at that bank for those 1995 revisions.

Madam Speaker, as one of the few Members of Congress who has actually gone through multiple CRA examinations, I can assure my colleagues that this rule could benefit from a thoughtful update.

The final rule clarifies what counts for CRA credit. It updates what bank activity counts for CRA credit. It evaluates the CRA performance of our financial institutions in a much more fair, open manner. It makes CRA reporting more transparent and faster. It reflects the fintech community of digital banking in our country today. And it enhances CRA for rural areas and Tribal areas in our country.

In short, the bank branch issue that the ranking member mentioned is serious. We have had a shrinking number

of banks since the original rule was proposed in 1977, and the CRA rule was connected to those bank branches. That is another reason for modernizing the rule.

Since we created this bank branch closure system by our economy contracting the number of banks, due to regulation and the like, it is a double whammy, so let's make sure that our banks can get credit for doing a good job on accessing of all of our communities, particularly our minority, low-to-moderate income, and rural areas served by those institutions.

Let's fix this problem by having the certainty that we have an effective CRA rule, that it is implemented properly, and that we can all see our constituencies benefited by that.

Let's let the Comptroller of the Currency do their job. They are the banking experts. They are the ones who have been managing this work. Congress should not be undermining it.

Madam Speaker, I thank the chairman for the time, and I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the resolution but support the work of the Community Reinvestment Act.

Ms. WATERS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. PRESSLEY), a member of the Financial Services Committee.

Ms. PRESSLEY. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of this critical resolution reversing a rule tainted by conflicts of interest and callous disregard for the communities most affected.

As hundreds of thousands take to the streets, as the cries for a reckoning with this Nation's past and present grow louder, this administration believes that the future is further deregulation.

Today, we reject the administration's position that it is banks that are deserving of our time and sympathy as further relief funding is denied to millions of struggling families.

There is no separating the history of banking from the history of racism in this country. Wall Street, our Nation's financial capital, is named after a structure erected by enslaved people and then served as a site where they were bought and sold.

Today, we have predatory lenders set up in Black communities, where systems of oppression ensure a steady stream of customers, communities that banks have decided are simply not worth their time or their business.

The Community Reinvestment Act reflects, and is a direct response to this history, and aims to reverse course.

I urge all of my colleagues to acknowledge the decades of divestment from our communities and to support this crucial civil rights legislation.

Mr. MCHENRY. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Janesville, Wisconsin (Mr. STEIL).

Mr. STEIL. Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the resolution of disapproval.

The Community Reinvestment Act is an important law that encourages investments in places like Racine, Kenosha, and Janesville, and communities in need across this country. But the rulings governing the CRA haven't been updated since 1995.

In the last 25 years, the banking industry has undergone significant changes. Small and medium-sized banks have consolidated and closed. Branches have disappeared from some rural and low-income areas. Technology has drastically affected the way millions of Americans are conducting their banking.

The CRA needs to be updated to fit the banking system we have today and to meet the needs of the communities in 2020. That is exactly what the OCC is trying to do with the new rule.

The new CRA rule provides financial institutions with greater clarity about which activities count for CRA credit and where that activity needs to take place. It also takes into account the reality that many banking activities are conducted online by giving banks that are largely digital credit for investing in areas where they take deposits.

By implementing consistent, objective metrics, the new CRA rule also makes it easier for examiners to measure the performance and to compare institutions. This resolution of disapproval would block all that progress, to the detriment of communities in need.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this resolution.

Ms. WATERS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ), who is also a member of the Financial Services Committee.

Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ. Madam Speaker, I thank Chairwoman WATERS for her continued leadership on the Community Reinvestment Act.

Over the last several weeks, our Nation has been gripped by the uprisings against anti-Black racism and systemic racial injustice across the United States. But there is a difference between saying that we believe in the inherent dignity, equality, and value of our Black brothers and sisters and actually committing to it. The Community Reinvestment Act is one such commitment.

Our Nation has an unconscionable racial wealth gap that is directly rooted in the racist financial practice of redlining, whereby Black communities had red lines drawn around them on a map and were systematically denied banking, housing, and economic opportunities.

As a result, generations of White communities were given a head start at homeownership, which was the foundation of generational wealth, while Black communities were denied.

This fuels a runaway generational wealth gap that haunts the United States today. It is a practice that continues, with over 60 metro areas, in this very moment, having banks that deny Black applicants at significantly higher rates than they do White applicants.

Now, the CRA is an antiracist, antipoverty policy that seeks to remedy some of the damage done.

Yet, while this administration and the Republican Party paid lip service to Black and Brown communities with toothless policing legislation, behind everyone's back, the OCC made moves to gut rules around the CRA and advance the continued economic oppression of Black people in the United States. In fact, these rule changes advance gentrification and value luxury housing over investment in Black lives.

Well, to that move, we have four words: Not on our watch. That is because, in this House, in the 116th House, under the leadership of Chairwoman WATERS, we will value Black lives.

Mr. MCHENRY. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. WATERS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GARCÍA), a member of the Financial Services Committee.

□ 1700

Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I thank Chairwoman WATERS for this opportunity.

I rise in support of this resolution and join my colleagues in opposition to the Trump administration's new rule that weakens implementation of the Community Reinvestment Act.

It is an outrage that the Trump administration's OCC issued this rule that guts a historic law in the midst of an unprecedented pandemic.

To add insult to injury, former Chairman Otting resigned his post immediately after issuing the rule so that he will avoid cleaning up the fallout from this mess. It is up to Congress to clean it up, and that is what we are seeking to do.

The Community Reinvestment Act was enacted more than 40 years ago and has been one of our most powerful tools against redlining and the perpetration of systemic racism and poverty.

Like so much of our country's history, the story of the CRA runs through Chicago, where a local community organizer in the Austin neighborhood, Gale Cincotta, led the fight against discriminatory housing injustice and earned the nickname ''Mother of the CRA.'' Through her work with her neighborhood association and National People's Action, Cincotta fought against redlining and disinvestment from our communities using some of the innovative and confrontational tactics that we recognize in today's protest movements.

My district is a working-class immigrant district, and Gale Cincotta and organizers like her across the country fought to pass the CRA so that communities like mine would not be left behind by financial institutions.

The OCC's rule allows lenders to count activities that have nothing to

do with improving our neighborhoods toward their requirements to serve low- and moderate-income communities, decrease transparency, and make it even harder to hold these institutions accountable. That is why we oppose it.

Mr. MCHENRY. Madam Speaker, I am prepared to close.

May I inquire if there are further speakers on the majority side.

Ms. WATERS. Madam Speaker, I have additional speakers.

Mr. MCHENRY. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. WATERS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CRIST), who is a member of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. CRIST. Madam Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to thank Chairwoman WATERS for promoting access to capital for minority borrowers.

Since the murder of George Floyd, our Nation has embarked on a true, broad-based push to defeat institutional racism. America is coming to realize that racism did not end with emancipation, and it did not end with civil rights. It is still very much with us all today.

So, as we commit ourselves to Black Lives Matter, we need to also ensure Black communities matter, Black homeownership matters, Black wealth matters, and Black businesses matter.

My hometown of south St. Petersburg, Florida, is blessed by a large and vibrant Black community where, despite their strength, pride, character, and entrepreneurial spirit, we are still working to overcome institutional racism. Underinvestment in the community, food deserts, and redlining exist.

This past weekend, I witnessed the unveiling of the Black Lives Matter mural in front of the Dr. Carter G. Woodson African American Museum. It is right near one of my favorite restaurants on the south side, Chief's Creole Cafe.

While the art moved me beyond words, reality quickly set in. The owners of Chief's Creole, the Brayboys, were told by their bank that they couldn't get a PPP loan, not because they didn't qualify, but because the big banks are leaving behind the smallest businesses, businesses overrepresented by Black, women, and veteran owners.

If the banks aren't making PPP loans to Black-owned businesses when they don't have skin in the game, how can we trust them to do the right thing when it is their own money at risk?

That is why the Community Reinvestment Act is so vitally important. That is why we need it to work for the communities it was actually designed to serve.

The OCC got it wrong. Vote ''yes'' to repeal the rule.

Mr. MCHENRY. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. WATERS. Madam Speaker, if Mr. MCHENRY has no more speakers, I am prepared to close.

Mr. MCHENRY. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

So, in closing, the Community Reinvestment Act, we agree, is an important law that is intended to support underserved communities across America. Maintaining the status quo also ignores the innovation and the needs of our community.

The innovations taking place to financial services and to banking over the last 25 years need to be addressed, but also the fact that we are not actually meeting the needs desperately needed in communities around our district, both the urban and rural.

The new regulations will increase investment and capital in communities and provide more clarity and transparency to all parties involved in the process. That is why it is a good update.

As we work to ensure a strong economic recovery for all Americans, it is critical we encourage financial institutions to continue to provide services for those most in need. The OCC's final rule will play an important role in this recovery effort by encouraging more capital, investment, and lending services in the communities hardest hid by COVID–19. That is good.

The OCC took a very thoughtful approach, embracing input from other agencies and stakeholders over the course of several years. The final rule builds in nearly all of the constructive criticism the agency has received through the open comment process. In fact, this shows the agency is willing to compromise but not willing to settle for the status quo.

The OCC's modernization of the CRA regulation is a long overdue update that will help our communities come into the 21st century stronger and healthier. The last time these regulations were revised was in 1995, when banking received most of their deposits through branches, and as such, the old regulations that are on the books still rely heavily on branch locations.

Quite frankly, what we have seen over the last 100 days in America is that branches are less vital than they were in previous generations, because most of these branches have been shut down in our States because our States are trying to do the right thing to address this health crisis. That is why we are wearing masks, that is why we are social distancing, and that is why we are trying to be responsible to one another and be thoughtful in our approach to one another.

But, unfortunately, this bill before us is a very straightforward up-and-down. I will say let's not support the status quo. Let's support innovation and an update to our regulation to meet the needs of our communities and to meet the needs that are so desperately needed both in the rural communities and the urban communities in America.

Vote against this resolution and support the underlying rule.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. WATERS. Madam Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from California has 8½ minutes remaining.

Ms. WATERS. Madam Speaker, before I move into my closing, I would like to correct Mr. MCHENRY, who said the FDIC approved the OCC CRA rule this week. That is not correct. My staff just called the FDIC to confirm that they did not approve the rule.

Mr. MCHENRY. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. WATERS. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. MCHENRY. I misspoke. I said they supported the CRA.

Ms. WATERS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD multiple letters from dozens of consumers, community and civil rights groups in support of H.J. Res. 90.

CHIEF COUNSEL'S OFFICE, OFFICE OF THE COMPTROLLER OF THE CURRENCY,

Washington, DC.

Attention: Comment Processing

We are writing to oppose the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (FDIC) and the Office of Comptroller of the Currency's (OCC) proposed changes that would seriously weaken the Community Reinvestment Act (CRA) The U.S. Conference of Mayors has strong policy supporting the CRA. The law was passed in 1977 to end redlining, and to meet the credit needs of communities where banks do business. Discrimination in lending still exists.

But the FDIC and OCC proposed changes would make the banks less accountable to their communities through complex and confusing performance measures on CRA exams while oversimplifying how bank's performances to local needs are measured. Moreover, public input into the process will be difficult and limited. This will result in significantly fewer loans, investments and services to communities most in need of more credit and capital.

The CRA has been of enormous benefit to low- and -moderate income Americans. For example, since 1996, CRA-covered banks issued more than 27 million small business loans in low-and moderate-income tracts, totaling $1.093 trillion, and $1.076 trillion in community development loans that support affordable housing and economic development projects benefitting low-and moderate-income communities.

While such results are very good, the proposed rule will make it all but impossible to continue such impressive results. Moreover, much more can be achieved by regulations that modernize the CRA to take into account changes in the banking industry and the economy. For example, independent mortgage companies not covered by CRA make more than 50 percent of the home mortgages in our nation. If anything, the CRA should be strengthened to reflect changing demographics and changes in the financial industry, and not weaken the CRA as the proposed rule would do. We strongly encourage you to reconsider a proposed rule, and look to modernizing CRA that will truly benefit low and moderate income citizens.

Sincerely,

Justin Wilson, Alexandria, VA; Satya Rhodes-Conway, Madison, WI; Alan L. Nagy, Newark, CA; Alan Webber, Santa Fe, NM; Sam Weaver, Boulder, CO; Carlo DeMaria Jr., Everett, MA; Robert Garcia, Long Beach, CA; Steve Benjamin, Columbia, SC; Jerome A. Prince, Gary, IN; Brian C. Wahler, Piscataway, NJ; Gregory J. Oravec, Port St.

Lucie, FL; Steve Adler, Austin, TX; Robert Donchez, Bethlehem, PA; Jack W. Bradley, Lorain, OH; David J. Berger, Lima, OH; Scott Conger, Jackson, TN; Joe Coviello, Cape Coral, FL; Denny Doyle, Beaverton, OR; Hillary Schieve, Reno, NV; Trey Mendez, Brownsville, TX; Patrick J. Furey, Torrance, CA; Marcia A. Leclerc, East Hartford, CT; Jesse Arreguin, Berkeley, CA; Jim Kenney, Philadelphia, PA; Nan Whaley, Dayton, OH; Christopher L. Cabaldon, West Sacramento, CA; Martin J. Walsh, Boston, MA; Allan Ekberg, Tukwila, WA; Jorge O. Elorza, Providence, RI; Juan Carlos Bermudez, Doral, FL; Frank C. Ortis, Pembroke Pines, FL; Bryan K. Barnett, Rochester Hills, MI; Jacob Frey, Minneapolis, MN; Ron Nirenberg, San Antonio, TX; Joy Cooper, Hallandale Beach, FL; Lyda Krewson, St. Louis, MO; Steve Schewel, Durham, NC; John Giles, Mesa, AZ; James B. Hovland, Edina, MN; Nathan Blackwell, St. Cloud, FL; Hazelle Rogers, Lauderdale Lakes, FL; Eric Johnson, Dallas, TX; Mark W. Mitchell, Tempe, AZ; Tom Dailly, Schaumburg, IL; Andy Berke, Chattanooga, TN; Pauline Russo Cutter, San Leandro, CA; Steve Gawron, Muskegon, MI; William Peduto, Pittsburgh, PA; Lioneld Jordan, Fayetteville, AR; Muriel Bowser, Washington, DC; Regina Romero, Tucson, AZ; Geoff Kors, Palm Springs, CA; Acquanetta Warren, Fontana, CA; Michael B. Hancock, Denver, CO; Mike Duggan, Detroit, MI; Leirion Gaylor Baird, Lincoln, NE; Keisha Lance Bottoms, Atlanta, GA; Greg Fischer, Louisville, KY; Victoria Woodards, Tacoma, WA; Tim Keller, Albuquerque, NM; Patrick L. Wojahn, College Park, MD; Louis 'Woody' L. Brown, Largo, FL; Ted Wheeler, Portland, OR; Erin J. Mendenhall, Salt Lake City, UT; Daniel J. Stermer, Weston, FL; John Cranley, Cincinnati, OH; Lori E. Lightfoot, Chicago, IL; Carolyn G. Goodman, Las Vegas, NV; Christina Muryn, Findlay, OH; James Allen Joines, Winston-Salem, NC; Sam Liccardo, San Jose, CA; Jon Mitchell, New Bedford, MA; Robert Restaino, Niagara Falls, NY; Chris Koos, Normal, IL; Lily Mei, Fremont, CA; Bridget Donnell Newton, Rockville, MD; Jeffrey Z. Slavin, Somerset, MD; Bernard 'Jack' C. Young, Baltimore, MD; Kenneth D. Miyagishima, Las Cruces, NM; Carol Dutra-Vernaci, Union City, CA; Mary Casillas Salas, Chula Vista, CA; Lucy K. Vinis, Eugene, OR; Thomas 'Tom' C. Henry, Fort Wayne, IN; Debra March, Henderson, NV; Andrew J. Ginther, Columbus, OH; Kevin McKeown, Santa Monica, CA; Anne McEnerny-Ogle, Vancouver, WA; Michael Vandersteen, Sheboygan, WI; David Anderson, Kalamazoo, MI; Melvin Carter, St. Paul, MN; Ashira Mohammed, Pembroke Park, FL; Amy Bublak, Turlock, CA; Daniel Rivera; Lawrence, MA; William 'Bill' Edwards, South Fulton, GA; Richard C. David, Binghamton, NY; Katrina Foley, Costa Mesa, CA; Shari Cantor, West Hartford, CT; Rex Hardin, Pompano Beach, FL; Tracy Johnson, Lockington, OH.

CALIFORNIA REINVESTMENT COALITION,
June 23, 2020.

CRC AND CA GROUPS SUPPORT H.J. RES. 90

DEAR SPEAKER PELOSI, The California Reinvestment Coalition (CRC) and our member organizations and allies write in strong support of H.J. Res. 90, the Congressional Review Act Resolution to reverse the harmful rule recently finalized by the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency (OCC) which would gut the Community Reinvestment Act (CRA). Please find following a letter from over sixty (60) California based and California servicing organizations in support of the Resolution.

The California Reinvestment Coalition builds an inclusive and fair economy that meets the needs of communities of color and low-income communities by ensuring that banks and other corporations invest and conduct business in our communities in a just and equitable manner.

The CRA is a critical piece of civil rights legislation that has worked to fight historic and continuing redlining practices, and to bring much needed lending and investment into low-income communities of color. The CRA encourages banks to help meet local community credit needs by creating opportunities for homeownership, small business ownership, job creation, financial capability, and affordable housing and community development in neighborhoods that have been otherwise excluded from the financial mainstream and the American dream.

The OCC's harmful rule will reverse these gains by substantially lowering the bar and enabling banks to get passing grades through activities that are further and further removed from low-income communities, homeowners, tenants and small businesses. The OCC takes this damaging action during a pandemic that has had a disproportionate impact on the very communities meant to benefit from CRA.

We urge all members of Congress to cosponsor and vote in favor of this important resolution. Defending civil rights and protecting communities ravaged by redlining and systemic racism has never been more important.

Thank you for your concern regarding these issues and your consideration of our views.

Very Truly Yours,

KEVIN STEIN,
Deputy Director.

Abundant Housing LA, AnewAmerica Community Corporation, Asian Pacific Islander Small Business Program, ASIAN, Inc., CAARMA Consumer Advocates Against Reverse Mortgage Abuse, Cabrillo Economic Development Corporation, California Capital Financial Development Corporation, California Coalition for Rural Housing, California Housing Partnership, California Reinvestment Coalition, California Resources and Training, CAMEO—California Association for Micro Enterprise Opportunity, CCEDA, CDC Small Business Finance, Center for Responsible Lending, CHOC, City Heights Community Development Corp, City of Livingston, Coachella Valley Housing Coalition, Coalition for Economic Survival (CES), Community Housing Development Corporation, Community Economics, Consumers for Auto Reliability and Safety, East Bay Asian Local Development Corporation, East Bay Housing Organizations (EBHO), Fair Housing Advocates of Northern California, Faith and Community Empowerment (formerly KCCD), Family Financial Well-Being Collaborative—Ventura County CA, Fresno CDFI dba Access Plus Capital, Home Preservation and Prevention Inc DBA HPP Cares, Housing Rights Center, LA Forward, Law Foundation of Silicon Valley, Los Angeles LDC, Main Street Launch, Merritt Community Capital Corporation, Mission Asset Fund (MAF), Mission Economic Development Agency (MEDA), Multicultural Real Estate Alliance for Urban Change, MyPath, Neighborhood Housing Services of Los Angeles County, NeighborWorks Orange County, Non-Profit Housing Association of Northern California (NPH), Opportunity Fund, Oxnard Housing Authority, Pahali Community Land Trust, Public Counsel, Public Good Law Center, Public Law Center, Reinvent South Stockton Coalition, Renaissance Entrepreneurship Center, Sacramento Housing Alliance, Sacramento Housing and Redevelopment Agency, Self-Help Federal Credit Union, Spanish Speaking Unity Council of Alameda County, Inc., Strategic Actions for a Just Economy (SAJE), Tenderloin Neighborhood Development Co, The Fair Housing Council of San Diego, The Public Interest Law Project, Ventura County Community Development Corporation, Western Center on Law & Poverty, Women's Economic Ventures, Working Solutions, Maria Benjamin (Deputy Dir, San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development), Nick Cortez (Chair, California Progressive Alliance), Mark Moulton (Vice Chair, EPA CAN DO).

THE LEADERSHIP CONFERENCE AND NATIONAL COMMUNITY REINVESTMENT COALITION,
June 23, 2020.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER PELOSI: We, the undersigned organizations, write to express our strong support for H.J. Res. 90, a Congressional Review Act resolution of disapproval that will nullify a rulemaking by the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency (OCC) that, if allowed to stand, would drastically undermine one of our nation's most important civil rights laws, the Community Reinvestment Act of 1977 (the CRA).

Enacted in 1977, the Community Reinvestment Act (CRA) has been vital in fighting redlining, a practice that systematically—and for decades, as a matter of federal policy—shut neighborhoods of color and lower-income communities out from home loans and other essential financial services. The CRA requires banks to undertake reasonable efforts to lend to and invest in all of the neighborhoods in areas where they do business. The law has helped to spur increased investments in formerly-redlined communities. It did not, however, prevent non-bank lenders (who are not subject to the CRA) from flooding communities of color with toxic subprime mortgages in the years before the 2008 crisis; and research shows that racial disparities in lending—which cannot be explained away by differences in credit scores—persist to this day.

It is clear that the CRA needs to be modernized and strengthened in order to fulfill its original purpose. But in January, the OCC and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (FDIC) published a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (NPRM) that would instead significantly weaken the CRA. The agencies proposed new overly simplistic metrics system that would make it far easier for banks to pass their CRA exams by making large investments in communities where they can reap the largest rewards, rather than carefully-targeted, smaller investments in underserved consumers and neighborhoods.

Even before the NPRM was published, a wide range of stakeholders weighed in with both the OCC and FDIC to raise concerns and to ask for more data justifying the changes. Those concerns were not addressed, and the data was never released. By the time the NPRM was published, the United States and the world were just beginning to learn about the growing threat posed by a dangerous new respiratory virus. In the coming weeks, it became clear that the virus had not been contained, and it spread rapidly to multiple countries including the United States. As stakeholders and the public began devoting more and more resources and attention to the health, social, and economic fallout of the growing pandemic, and many urged the OCC and FDIC to temporarily suspend rulemaking not related to COVID–19, the agencies continued plowing ahead, only agreeing to a one-month extension for comments.

In the days before the deadline for comments on the rule, it had become clear that COVID–19 was proving fatal to communities

of color—the very communities the CRA was intended to help—at a rate several times higher than the population at large; the U.S. Surgeon General warned the public to prepare for ''our 9/11 moment,'' and models predicted 100,000 or more deaths in the United States alone. Only 41 days after the comment period ended, and even though only a minority of commenters voiced support for the new framework, the OCC rushed through a final rule that left it largely intact. The FDIC, to its credit, declined to finalize its version of the rule at this time.

In the weeks since the OCC finalized its rule, our nation has been facing a long-overdue reckoning with our troubled legacy of racial and ethnic discrimination. While much of the conversation has rightly been focused on police brutality and the impact of over-policing in communities of color, this conversation is inexorably tied to the lasting economic, social, and legal legacy of redlining and other forms of racial discrimination.

We will not succeed in addressing issues surrounding law enforcement in communities of color without also addressing decades of underinvestment in housing, employment, education, health care, transportation, and other factors that, to this day, have contributed to the longstanding disparities that are once again coming to light. Now is certainly not the time to weaken the most important civil rights laws we have at our disposal to correct those disparities.

As such, we urge Congress to support H.J. Res. 90, to overturn the OCC's regulatory attack on the Community Reinvestment Act. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely

Alianza Nacional de Campesinas, Americans for Financial Reform, Color of Change, Consortium for Citizens with Disabilities Housing Task Force, Consumer Action, Equality California, Impact Fund, The Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights, Matthew Shepard Foundation, National Association for Latino Community Asset Builders (NALCAB), National Association of Consumer Advocates, National Community Reinvestment Coalition, National Community Stabilization Trust, The National Council of Asian Pacific Americans (NCAPA), National LGBTQ Task Force Action Fund, National Urban League, Prosperity Now, Woodstock Institute.

JUNE 23, 2020.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

U.S. Capitol,

Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: The Center for Responsible Lending writes to express our strong support for H.J. Res. 90, a Congressional Review Act resolution of disapproval that will invalidate the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency (OCC) final rule on the Community Reinvestment Act.

The Community Reinvestment Act of 1977 (CRA) was one in a series of landmark civil rights legislation and is a critical tool to help our nation work toward overcoming the legacy of redlining. Today's racial wealth gap and lending disparities are in large part the result of decades of government policies and practices that enabled the redlining of communities of color for most of the 20th century. In the post-Depression era, federal policies that created housing opportunities for returning veterans and their families explicitly excluded people of color from the benefits of government-supported housing programs. Among these programs were public housing, the Home Owners' Loan Corporation (HOLC), and mortgage insurance through the Federal Housing Administration (FHA). Not only did this redlining segregate residential neighborhoods across the United States, but it granted whites the ability to build wealth through homeownership while denying equal opportunities for families of color to build similar home equity over the same period. The inequities that result from these discriminatory programs are part of the injustices that today's people led protests are demanding are addressed.

The CRA imposes continuing and affirmative obligations on banks to help meet the credit needs of the local communities in which they are chartered and continues to be an important tool for fostering access to credit for these communities today. The law has urged banks to more actively lend in LMI areas; it has also played a key role in ensuring bank participation in community revitalization efforts across the country.

Despite the importance of CRA and the community investment it has spurred, CRA rules must be strengthened. The CRA as applied has not done nearly enough to revitalize previously redlined areas and has not made a substantial dent in the lagging homeownership rate for people of color. The white homeownership rate is 73.7% while the rate is 44% and 48.9% for Black and Latino borrowers respectively. Additionally, bank lending in LMI communities and communities of color has declined dramatically since the Great Recession. And existing disparities will be further perpetuated in the face of the COVID–19 global public health and economic crisis.

Unfortunately, the OCC decided to act unilaterally—without the Federal Reserve and Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation—to issue a structurally flawed final rule that weakens the CRA and will harm low- and moderate-communities and communities of color. Rather than postpone rulemaking to focus on the devastating economic crisis caused by the COVID–19 health pandemic, the OCC issued the rule a mere six weeks after the closing of the comment period on its proposed rule despite broad requests for delay from community groups, civil rights and consumer organizations, and industry. The OCC acknowledged in the preamble to the final rule that most of the comments disagreed with the proposal's approach. Yet, the OCC decided to side with the minority of comments in support of the proposed rule. The OCC's rule will harm the communities most adversely affected by the current crisis, including many families that were hardest hit by the Great Recession and have yet to recover.

The final rule imposes an overly simplistic evaluation measure that fails to ensure that local banking needs are met, and sanctions bank redlining. The rule overvalues the dollar amount of CRA activities in comparison to the quality of such activities and allows banks to earn more credit for easier and larger investments in communities from which they can get the highest return. Indeed, the rule permits banks to ignore 20% of their assessment areas and still pass, resulting in unchecked neighborhood disinvestment and redlining. The rule also disincentives investment in LMI neighborhoods and communities of color. It incentivizes activities and investments that do not ''primarily'' benefit LMI communities, such as large-scale infrastructure projects. Estimating such projects' impact on LMI neighborhoods is difficult and thus will likely divest funds away from smaller scale, yet impactful community development activities. Furthermore, the rule reduces the importance of retail lending and retail services, resulting in less lending and investments in communities that are already credit starved. The rule is opposite to the CRA's statutory mission and will cause deep harm to communities.

We urge support for H.J. Res. 90 to reverse the OCC's regulatory attack on the Community Reinvestment Act. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

CENTER FOR RESPONSIBLE LENDING.

Ms. WATERS. Madam Speaker, I would like to close by thanking Representative MEEKS for his leadership on this issue. I appreciate the support we have received from our colleagues in this effort.

Make no mistake, unchecked, the OCC's final rule will harm low- income and minority communities that are disproportionately suffering during this COVID–19 crisis, and it will turn the Community Reinvestment Act into the community disinvestment act.

In passing this Congressional Review Act resolution, we are not only nullifying the OCC rule, but we are sending two clear messages: regulators should be focused on protecting the economy from the pandemic and not on removing safeguards, and that after the pandemic, the OCC should go back to the drawing board and work with the Federal Reserve and FDIC to jointly issue a new rule that strengthens the Community Reinvestment Act and helps low-and moderate-income communities, including communities of color.

For over a month now, by the thousands, Americans have been marching in the streets for justice. They are standing up against racism and fighting for justice for all. Just yesterday, this House passed historic legislation to reform our Nation's police forces and the unfair treatment so many people of color have experienced at the hands of those meant to serve and protect.

As we unite to fight against discrimination in our criminal justice system, we must also fight against discrimination, disinvestment, and injustice in our financial system and economic injustice in our communities. The OCC's rule would encourage disinvestment in communities of color and lead to redlining on a massive scale. We must stand up against this blatant effort to economically disenfranchise hundreds of low-income and minority communities nationwide.

So I want to say to my Members on the opposite side of the aisle: I have heard this theme that you support the Community Reinvestment Act but you don't support my bill.

I would say to the Members: You can't have it both ways.

Madam Speaker, I ask for an ''aye'' vote on H.J. Res. 90, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, I submit the following letters to be included in the debate on H.J. Res. 90. The following letters express support for H.J. Res. 90.

NATIONAL COMMUNITY
REINVESTMENT COALITION,
June 23, 2020.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

U.S. Capitol,

Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the undersigned organizations, we are writing to urge you to cosponsor and support H.J. Res.

90, a disapproval resolution that would overturn a poorly constructed rule change on the Community Reinvestment Act (CRA) hastily finalized in May, days before Comptroller Otting's resignation from the agency, and published this month.

At the outset, it is critical to note that the Trump Administration is split on the CRA final rule. With a lack of interagency coordination among the nation's bank regulators, different banks will be held to different reinvestment standards depending on their regulator—an outcome that both banks and advocates have cautioned against. Federal Reserve Chairman Jerome Powell testified just last week that he expects the agency to move forward with CRA updates intended to garner ''broad support among the community of intended beneficiaries'' something he considers to be ''one non-negotiable condition for it.'' The OCC's final rule achieved no such support or consensus. The vast majority of public comments—about 90 percent—opposed the CRA evaluation measure and presumptive ratings framework that remains at the heart of the final rule, but the OCC adopted it anyway.

The OCC's final rule makes a series of changes to the CRA regulatory framework that reduce incentives for banks to lend to low-and-moderate income (LMI) families and invest and serve LMI communities: home buyers and homeowners, small businesses, community development projects that primarily benefit and serve LMI people. It also expands the number of banks that will have no review of how they open and close bank branches and provide key bank services in LMI and underserved neighborhoods.

These harmful changes could not come at a worse time. The ongoing COVID–19 pandemic and widespread social unrest that is gripping the nation has hit LMI and communities of color the hardest and brought gapping disparities to the forefront. The changes to the CRA being pushed through by the OCC would do little to address the pressing national priorities of reducing the racial wealth gap, of better serving those traditionally underserved by the nation's financial system or stimulating an economic recovery from COVID–19 that is equitable. While the OCC claims its aim is to increase CRA activity, the lack of interagency agreement among this Administration's regulators should serve as a dire warning about that claim. We do not yet know the full impact of COVID–19 on local mortgage markets, small business resiliency, or how LMI households, neighborhoods, local jobs, and key sectors will recover. Weakening CRA at this moment is a blueprint for a crisis after the crisis.

For all these reasons and more, we urge you to cosponsor H.J. Res. 90 and support it when it is considered on the House floor.

Sincerely,

NATIONAL GROUPS

National Community Reinvestment Coalition (NCRC): AFL–CIO, Americans for Financial Reform, Center for Community Progress, Consumer Action, Local Initiatives Support Corporation (LISC), NACEDA, National Association for Latino Community Asset Builders (NALCAB), National Housing Resource Center, National Housing Trust, National NeighborWorks Association, National Urban League, Prosperity Now, The Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights, UnidosUS.

ALABAMA

Titusville Development Corporation.

ARIZONA

Arizona Housing Coalition, Local First Arizona, Local First Arizona Foundation.

CALIFORNIA

California Coalition for Rural Housing; California Reinvestment Coalition; California Resources and Training; CDC Small Business Finance; EAH Housing; Grounded Solutions Network; High Impact Financial Analysis, LLC; Peoples' Self-Help Housing; The Greenlining Institute; VEDC.

COLORADO

Urban Land Conservancy.

CONNECTICUT

Neighborhood Housing Services of Waterbury.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Africa Diaspora Directorate.

DELAWARE

Delaware Community Reinvestment Action Council, Inc.; Edgemoor Revitalization Cooperative, Inc.; The Ministry of Caring Inc.

FLORIDA

Affordable Homeownership Foundation, Inc.; Community Reinvestment Alliance of South Florida; Goldenrule Housing & Community Development Corp Inc; Metro North Community Development Corp.; Solita's House.

HAWAII

Hawai'i Alliance for Community-Based Economic Development.

ILLINOIS

Accion Serving Illinois & Indiana; Chicago Community Loan Fund; Chicago Rehab Network; Housing Action Illinois; NW HomeStart, Inc.; Woodstock Institute.

INDIANA

Continuum of Care Network NWI, Inc.; HomesteadCS; Legacy Foundation; Prosperity Indiana.

KENTUCKY

River City Housing.

LOUISIANA

Multi-Cultural Development Center.

MASSACHUSETTS

Greater Boston Legal Services, Massachusetts Affordable Housing Alliance.

MARYLAND

African American Chamber of Commerce of Montgomery County, Maryland Consumer Rights Coalition, Maryland Consumer Rights Coalition, Rebirth Inc., Residential Housing Counseling Agency.

MAINE

Coastal Enterprises, Inc.

MICHIGAN

Fair Housing Center of Metropolitan Detroit, GenesisHOPE, Habitat for Humanity of Michigan, Southwest Economic Solutions.

MISSOURI

Metropolitan St. Louis Equal Housing and Opportunity Council.

MISSISSIPPI

Hope Enterprise Corporation, Montgomery Citizens United for Prosperity (MCUP).

MONTANA

Montana Fair Housing, Inc.

NORTH CAROLINA

Reinvestment Partners.

NEW JERSEY

NCRC Housing Rehab Fund, LLC; New Jersey Association on Correction; New Jersey Citizen Action; New Jersey Community Capital.

NEW MEXICO

Southwest Neighborhood Housing Services.

NEW YORK

Association for Neighborhood and Housing Development (ANHD); Banana Kelly Community Improvement Association; Beaulac Associates LLC; BOC Capital Corp. CDFI; Business Outreach Center Network; Center for NYC Neighborhoods; Chhaya Community Development Corporation; Community Capital New York; Community Development Venture Capital Alliance; CNY Fair Housing, Inc.; Community Loan Fund of the Capital Region, Inc.; Fair Finance Watch; Fidelis Federal Credit Union; Fifth Avenue Committee; Genesee Co-op FCU; Greater Jamaica Development Corporation; Habitat for Humanity New York City; Habitat NYC Community Fund; La Fuerza CDC; Neighbors Helping Neighbors; NYS CDFI Coalition; Oswego County Federal Credit Union; PathStone Enterprise Center, Inc.; Renaissance Economic Development Corp.; The Knowledge House; Three Jewels Outreach Center; University Neighborhood Housing Program.

OHIO

Cleveland Neighborhood Progress; Columbus Compact dba Columbus Empowerment Corp.; County Corp.; Homes on the Hill, CDC; Ohio CDC Association; The Fair Housing Center for Rights & Research; Working In Neighborhoods.

OREGON

Housing Oregon.

PENNSYLVANIA

Amani Christian Community Development; Beltzhoover Consensus Group; Berks Latino Workforce Development Corporation (BLWDC); Bloomfield-Garfield Corporation; Chester Community Improvement Project; Fair Housing Rights Center in Southeastern Pennsylvania; Good Bricks Ventures LLC; Hilltop Alliance; Housing Committee; Jave Jive Coffee LLC; Mount Washington Community Development Corporation; Northside Leadership Conference; PHDA Pittsburgh Housing Development Association, Inc.; Philadelphia Association of Community Development Corporations; Pittsburgh Community Reinvestment Group; Rising Tide Partners; Southwest CDC; The Enterprise Center; Tube City Renaissance; Wilkinsburg Community Development Corporation.

RHODE ISLAND

HousingWorks RI.

TEXAS

Our Casas Resident Council INC., Recon Foundation, Southern Dallas Progress Community Development Corporation.

UTAH

Rocky Mountain Community Reinvestment Corporation.

WASHINGTON

Low Income Housing Institute.

WISCONSIN

Citizen Action of Wisconsin; Disability Justice; Metropolitan Milwaukee Fair Housing Council; Movin' Out, Inc.; United Community Center; Urban Economic Development Association of Wisconsin (UEDA); Washington Park Housing Comm; YWCA Southeast Wisconsin; Revitalize Milwaukee.

NATIONAL HOUSING CONFERENCE,
Washington, DC, June 22, 2020.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER PELOSI: I am writing on behalf of the National Housing Conference (NHC) to express our strong support for H.J. Res. 90, the Congressional Review Act resolution of disapproval of the Community Reinvestment Act (CRA) final rule.

The Office of the Comptroller of the Currency (OCC) has issued its final CRA rule just six weeks after the end of the comment period on the Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (NPR) and amid the worst health and economic crisis of our lifetimes. Implementation of this rule poses a material

threat to our recovery from the COVID–19 recession and undercuts the purpose and intent of CRA, harming underserved communities throughout the nation.

As NHC stated in its formal comment letter on the CRA NPR on April 8, we have no idea how severely the pandemic will impact our economy, the financial system and communities throughout the nation. Committing resources to regulatory initiatives that do not directly support our national response to the COVID–19 pandemic is a dangerous distraction: On April 27, NHC joined 14 other major national organizations, including the National Association of REALTORS and the National League of Cities, to urge regulators to refrain from committing resources to regulatory initiatives that do not directly support our national response to the COVID–19 pandemic.

Notably, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (FDIC) and the Federal Reserve Board refused to join the OCC on this ill-timed decision. As FDIC Chairman Jelena McWilliams noted in her March 19, 2020 letter to the Financial Accounting Standards Board, financial institutions ''will face unique difficulties over the coming weeks and months to adequately staff customer-facing functions; ensure that deposit, loan, and IT systems operate normally; help borrowers that are experiencing unanticipated cash flow difficulties; and address the earnings and capital implications of near zero percent interest rates and a potential surge in borrowers who are unable to meet contractual payment terms.'' We could not agree more.

CRA modernization is a once-in-a-generation opportunity. There is much to improve, as the law and most recent regulations were written before the proliferation of interstate banking, internet banking and the revitalization of America's cities; the latter being the opposite trend of one of the two major reasons for CRA's adoption—urban disinvestment—as well as the stubborn persistence of redlining and its legacy impact. Instead, the OCC has pursued an entirely new system that will gut CRA's effectiveness for years and undercut broader efforts to address the very issues that Congress attempted to solve in 1977, and still struggles with today.

The OCC's rule has received nearly universal condemnation. Using its ratio-driven approach, banks will be powerfully incented to make only the largest investments in communities that need it the least, and may also fuel the displacement of those people who need it the most. This rule eliminates the fundamental value of CRA, which at its best, levels the playing field between large, highly profitable investments, and the harder and smaller but still profitable deals that often have disproportionately positive impact on communities; and are by their nature, harder to get an allocation of capital from a bank that we want to be governed by a culture that focuses on a risk-weighted return.

CRA modernization is long overdue and needs to be done so banks and communities get the clarity and flexibility they need to ensure it has the maximum positive impact. But no modernization effort is worth gutting the central purpose of CRA—constructive reinvestment in the communities that need it most. Consequently, the National Housing Conference strongly supports H.J. Res. 90 and hope that once this unprecedented national crisis is behind us, we can all work together to fully realize the purpose and intent of CRA.

Sincerely,

DAVID M. DWORKIN,
President and CEO.

HOPE,
June 23, 2020.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House,
House of Representatives.

SUPPORT FOR H.J. RES. 90

HOPE (Hope Enterprise Corporation/Hope Credit Union/Hope Policy Institute) supposes H.J Res. 90, providing for congressional disapproval of the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency's (OCC) final rule overhauling the Community Reinvestment Act.

HOPE is a Black-led, women-owned community development financial institution, credit union, and policy institute in Jackson, Mississippi. HOPE was established 25 years ago to ensure that all people regardless of where they live, their gender, race or place of birth have the opportunity to support their families and realize the American Dream. HOPE has generated over $2.5 billion in financing that has benefitted more than 1.5 million people throughout Alabama, Arkansas, Louisiana, Mississippi and Tennessee.

The Community Reinvestment Act (CRA) has been a critical tool for HOPE to leverage the resources it needs to serve low-income communities, rural communities, and communities of color in the Deep South. Unfortunately, the OCC's final rule moves the CRA—and economic opportunity for our communities—further out of reach in three ways:

Incenting larger, easier activities, potentially reducing the smaller, more intensive investments that Deep South communities so often need,

Deprioritizing meaningful CRA activities in the country's most distressed communities, and

Diverting investments to activities far from the CRA's original intent of redressing redlining.

As just one example, the OCC's failure to prioritize bank branches in low-income and rural areas will be acutely felt in the Deep South, where already much of the region is already in a banking desert and includes areas with the highest percentage of persons who are unbanked in the United States. Mississippi and Louisiana, with over 15% of unbanked residents, have the highest percentage among all states. The rate of unbanked Black households is even higher, at 28% both states. As made plain during COVID–19, these disparities in access to banking relationships lay the foundation for broader disparities in access to capital for small businesses and individuals.

Ultimately, the OCC's final rule widens the wealth gap and further inhibits economic opportunity in already hard-pressed areas of the country, particularly here in the Deep South.

NATIONAL ALLIANCE OF COMMUNITY ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATIONS,

June 23, 2020.

REPRESENTATIVE MAXINE WATERS,
Chairwoman, House Financial Services Committee, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRWOMAN WATERS: Thank you for leading and actively supporting H.J. Res. 90, a disapproval resolution to overturn the Community Reinvestment Act rule change finalized by the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency (OCC) in May 2020. The National Alliance of Community Economic Development Associations (NACEDA) and our members find the OCC's final rule deeply problematic for low and moderate-income communities for the reasons outlined in our public comment letter dated April, 8, 2020.

The final rule addresses very few of the concerns we expressed in our April letter. The final rule is deeply problematic and fundamentally flawed.

To paraphrase FDIC Board Member Martin Gruenberg's statement on December 12, 2019, in opposition to the proposed rule, the proposed rule severely undermines what has been a core strength of CRA for 40 years—the encouragement of bank engagement and dialogue with stakeholders in local communities, including community-based organizations, community development corporations, and others, to understand and better serve historically underserved areas. For this reason and more, we support your committee's Congressional Review Act resolution to overturn the rule change.

Sincerely,

FRANK WOODRUFF,
Executive Director, National Alliance of Community Economic Development Associations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 1017, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. WATERS. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3 of House Resolution 965, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

HONORING THE LIFE OF MARNY XIONG

(Ms. MCCOLLUM asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Marny Xiong, the chairwoman of the Saint Paul Public Schools Board of Education, who passed away from COVID–19 on June 7 at the age of 31. We mourn the loss of this young woman, a rising star whose legacy was an inspiration to us all.

Marny was a trailblazing activist and a proud member of Saint Paul's Hmong community. She was a dedicated advocate for young people, and she stood up for equality and racial justice. She understood the disparities that students of color face in our State, and she worked to make sure that every child had an opportunity to succeed.

As chairwoman of the board, her leadership was critical to successfully resolving the district's first ever teachers' strike. When confronted with the COVID–19 pandemic, Marny helped to steer the district's unprecedented transition to distance learning for 37,000 students.

It is heartbreaking that this pandemic has taken one of our community's rising leaders.

Madam Speaker, please join me in extending condolences to Marny's parents, her seven siblings, her extended family, and her friends at this time of great grief.

□ 1715

POLICING IS STATE AND LOCAL RESPONSIBILITY

(Mr. ARRINGTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ARRINGTON. Madam Speaker, the vast majority of law enforcement across the country are good. They are competent. They are professional. And they serve with integrity. And when they don't, with the immense power they have over their fellow citizens, they must be held accountable, but that starts at the local level.

Policing is a State and local responsibility, not a Federal responsibility. When local leaders fail to do their job and citizens fail to hold them accountable, the system breaks down. You have incidences of abuse and, sometimes, cultures of corruption.

So what is the solution? It is not another top-down, one-size-fits-all from Washington, D.C.

We don't need to Federalize policing. We need to hold our local leaders accountable. We need to come alongside of them at all levels of government to make sure that we don't recycle the bad actors. So we get rid of them. And if we do, then the 1 percent won't take the 99 percent that are protecting and serving us and risking their lives to do so.

IN MEMORY OF DR. JAMES HENRY NEELY

(Mr. KELLY of Mississippi asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KELLY of Mississippi. Madam Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the life of Dr. James Henry Neely, who passed away on Monday, June 22, in Oxford, Mississippi.

Dr. Neely was born August 8, 1932, in West Point, Mississippi. His many accomplishments began at Mary Holmes College High School. He was the editor of the school newspaper, secretary of the senior class, president of the athletic club, and member at large of the student council. He took his successes to Kentucky State University, earning a degree in chemistry and a minor in math and French.

His passion for chemistry and academia led Dr. Neely to Meharry Medical College in 1960. After graduation, he took his leadership skills to the United States Air Force, where he served honorably until his discharge in 1964, and he relocated in Tupelo, Mississippi. He served his community as a medical practitioner for 35 years. He was the first African American doctor to have hospital privileges, admitting privileges, and could treat patients at North Mississippi Medical Center.

He would go on to earn the Mississippi Medical Surgical Award, Practitioner of the Year, and Meharry Medical College Distinguished Service Award. Dr. Neely, though, will tell you his greatest accomplishment was his marriage to Elaine Kilgore for 66 years.

Outside of the medical profession, Dr. Neely held many memberships, including the National Medical Association, the Black Business Association of Mississippi, the NAACP, and was a member of the West Point Trinity United Presbyterian Church. He was not only a prominent figure in the medical field, but in the community in which he served.

Left to cherish his memory is his wife, Elaine; his son, my friend and mentor and an assistant district attorney in my office, Brian Neely; his daughter, acclaimed poet and Goodwill Ambassador for the State of Mississippi, Patricia Neely-Dorsey; his four grandchildren, and many others.

Dr. Neely led a life we should all admire. He affected change in Mississippi and this Nation by his life of public service.

IN HONOR OF MONSIGNOR J. GASTON HEBERT'S 60TH ORDINATION

(Mr. HILL of Arkansas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HILL of Arkansas. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Monsignor J. Gaston Hebert's 60th ordination as a priest as well as to salute his lasting contributions to our Catholic diocese in Arkansas.

He was baptized and received his First Communion at St. Mary Church in Hot Springs, where he also celebrated his first mass as an ordained priest in 1960.

I was privileged to have Monsignor Hebert as my teacher at Catholic High School in Little Rock, where he served as an English and drama teacher from 1960 to 1965.

Even after he retired from serving as the pastor of Christ the King Church in Little Rock for 20 years, he continued to serve the diocese in Arkansas as vicar general under Bishop Andrew McDonald and Archbishop J. Peter Sartain. And again, importantly, as our diocesan administrator from 2006 to 2008, prior to the Holy Father's appointment of Bishop Anthony Taylor.

Monsignor Hebert has served our community faithfully, and I thank him for his love, dedication, and years of service.

Madam Speaker, we miss seeing him and are forever grateful.

REMEMBERING DEPUTY JAMES BLAIR

(Mr. GUEST asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GUEST. Madam Speaker, last week, we were reminded once again of the great sacrifice made by the men and women of law enforcement as family, friends, and fellow officers gathered to pay their respects to Deputy James Blair, who lost his life in the line of duty on Friday, June 12 in Simpson County, Mississippi.

Deputy Blair was a husband, a father, a grandfather, and a great-grandfather, who devoted his life to his family, his community, and to law enforcement. He was a generous man who was deeply loved and worked to support his grandchildren following the passing of their mother.

Deputy Blair spent over 50 years of his life in service to his fellow man through law enforcement. He will be deeply missed by our Mississippi family, but his selfless spirit will live on through the memory of his sacrifice and through those who had the privilege of knowing him during his time on this Earth.

Please join me in a moment of silence in remembrance of Deputy James Blair.

DESECRATION OF MONUMENTS

(Mr. LAMALFA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAMALFA. Madam Speaker, you would have to be living in a hole somewhere to not have noticed that across the Nation, the desecration happening to our national monuments, statues, memorials, and even the vandalization of some of our large cities has been running rampant.

It is time for that to end. In many cases, these acts of vandalism are targeted towards longtime institutions of those that tirelessly fought for our freedoms. This desecration must end. And there must be severe penalties for doing these felonious acts.

We have seen George Washington statues, the Father of our country, who valued freedom above all else, knocked down. Ulysses S. Grant, the Commanding General of the Union Army, who helped stop the slavery effort of the South, who signed the Civil Rights Act of 1875 and the ratification of the 15th Amendment, was toppled in San Francisco. Abraham Lincoln, who freed so many from slavery. Even down the street from here, they are having to guard the Mary McLeod Bethune statues down there at Lincoln Park, along with Mr. Lincoln. And she was a key element of FDR's original Federal Council of Negro Affairs, otherwise known as the ''Black Cabinet.''

There is not even any logic or sense to the vandalism and chaos that is going on here when they are tearing down statues on all sides of the issue. It needs to be stopped, and there needs to be harsh penalties for those doing this.

IN RECOGNITION OF SID MARTIN BIOTECH UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA

(Mr. YOHO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YOHO. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Sid Martin Biotech at the University of Florida for winning the Randall M. Whaley Incubator of the Year Award, the top award given by the International Business Innovation Association.

This marks the third time in the last 10 years that Sid Martin Biotech has been recognized as the top incubator in the world. Even more, Sid Martin Biotech is the only program in the world to win more than one Randall M. Whaley award. This is a tremendous feat, and I am proud that this program is located in North Central Florida in Florida's Third Congressional District.

Sid Martin Biotech has incubated 106 startups since its first opening. These companies have raised over $8.8 billion in funding and created over 8,000 high-tech jobs.

Madam Speaker, I congratulate the entire team at Sid Martin Biotech for this great accomplishment, and I am confident that this success will continue in the future.

Go Gators.

UNITE AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. DEAN). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BIGGS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. BIGGS. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS).

IN MEMORY OF MARY ELLEN WITTER

Mr. SHIMKUS. Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague for the time and courtesy.

Madam Speaker, I rise to speak about my West Point mom, who just recently passed away. Mary Ellen Witter of Bluffton, South Carolina, passed away peacefully Sunday, June 21, 2020, with her family around her.

My West Point mom, who loved me even though I ate her food, broke her chairs, and disobeyed a rule now and then. She was the definition of grace.

She was preceded in death by her husband, the love of her life, Colonel Lee Witter. They were married 61 years. She was the daughter of the late Allan and Alma Imse, born in Milwaukee, Wisconsin in 1937.

Mary Ellen went to the University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee, for her bachelor's degree in Elementary Education. She received her masters from C.W. Post Center, Long Island University, New York, in Library Science.

She was a dedicated military wife. She represented America while being an embassy military wife in Indonesia. She was a longtime educator, both here and abroad.

Mary Ellen was a pianist, singer, and a devout Christian, who was very active in her church and was part of the Stephen Ministries and prayer groups. For those who knew her, she was a soft-spoken woman who loved traveling, reading, gardening, camping, bird-watching, and going to the beach. But most of all, she loved her family and her friends.

She was preceded in death by her son, Mathew. She is survived by her two daughters, Nanette Jordan of Norwalk, Connecticut, and Dorinda Selby of Beaufort, South Carolina. She is survived by her sister, Sharon Quade of Crandon, Wisconsin, and her brother, Robert Imse of Naples, Florida. She dearly loved her five grandchildren: Ashley Benusa of Hong Kong; Taylor Jordan of Boston, Massachusetts; Zachary Jordan of Waterbury, Connecticut; Senior Airman Mathew Selby of Davis Monthan Air Force Base, Tucson, Arizona; and Thomas Selby of Beaufort, South Carolina.

Madam Speaker, I look forward to attending the burial service, which will take place at West Point Military Academy National Cemetery at a later date. There, she will be laid next to her husband, Colonel Witter, and her son, Mathew.

First Thessalonians 4:14 states: ''For we believe that Jesus died and rose again and so we believe that God will bring with Jesus those who have fallen asleep in him.'' May we find comfort in this promise.

Mr. BIGGS. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his words and express condolences for his loss of his dear friend.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs. LESKO), my colleague and longtime friend.

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BIGGS) for yielding me the time.

Lawlessness has broken out across our Nation. It is absolutely outrageous, and it has to be stopped. Mobs are taking over parts of the city of Seattle. They took over a police precinct.

Just last Saturday, people were shot, and one man was killed. Criminals are looting stores and businesses all over the Nation, including in Arizona in the upscale Scottsdale Fashion Square. Protestors are throwing bricks at police officers. They are throwing water bottles at police officers. And I have seen them shine flashlights right up close into the police officers' eyes and call them all kinds of names. Rioters are burning the flag, the American flag. And the Lincoln Memorial and World War II Memorial have been defaced.

Madam Speaker, a few days ago, St. Serra, the patron saint of peace, was torn down in San Francisco.

Francis Scott Key's statue was torn down.

The statue of Ulysses Grant, who was the general for the Union was torn down by thugs in San Francisco.

□ 1730

And then we saw the other night how they were trying so hard, these criminals, to tear down the statue in Lafayette Park. And they almost had it torn down, if it wasn't for the Trump administration sending in the National Guard to stop.

And do you know what they wrote and spray-painted on that statue, that Federal statue? ''Killer scum.''

Does any of this show tribute to George Floyd? No.

Does any of this help? Absolutely not.

Now, I was really surprised to see that one of our colleagues, Congresswoman NORTON, who is a nonvoting Member but represents Washington, D.C., has introduced legislation to have a statue of Abraham Lincoln taken down, a statue that was funded by the freed slaves.

What has our country come to? We need to return to a semblance of civility in our country. And so that is why I call on Democrat-run cities to clamp down on these criminals. No more autonomous zones. No more looting. No more destructing statues. Let's bring back law and order.

That is why I stand with President Trump and his calls to arrest and prosecute criminals. Let's stop the lawlessness. Let's try to heal our country.

Mr. BIGGS. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman, and I appreciate her comments.

We do see an increase in the amount of lawlessness. We have moved from peaceful protests, which I support, I understand. That is what the guarantee of the First Amendment is for. We all get a right to assemble with whom we want to assemble with. We get a right to speak. We get a right to seek redress of grievances from the government. All of those are important rights that we support, we stand for.

But we move into rioting, looting, mayhem. There has been murder. There has been assaults. There has been brutal violence.

I have heard some of my colleagues in this body call those protests. It is not protesting. That is lawless rioting, and it needs to be curbed and checked.

I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BISHOP).

Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, the coronavirus pandemic reminded us that we are in this together. Despite serious and, as yet, unresolved ongoing questions about policy responses to that event, we have stayed home and sacrificed for our neighbors' health. We have seen the best of us.

But in the past month, we are seeing the worst of us: violent mobs stoning business owners, Federal agents shot to death, looting occurring nationwide, and avowed Marxist activists openly defending and promoting it, six blocks of a major U.S. city ceded to anarchists.

I don't recognize this America. People experience fear repeatedly of the

wanton destruction of their livelihoods, their cities on fire or being canceled by social media mobs; government buildings attacked; monuments and memorials spanning the breadth of our history, from Washington to Lincoln to Roosevelt, torn down or threatened by riotous mobs.

And this is not impassioned, heat-of-the-moment destruction. It is a targeted, organized, and methodical purge of figures who represent ideas they wish to bury, ideas such as all people are endowed by our creator with inalienable rights to life, liberty, and property, and that government by, for, and of the people shall not perish from the Earth.

We have seen this deliberate tactic throughout history, in communist China's cultural revolution, in the theocratic purge of Afghanistan's Taliban, even in the terror campaigns of the Reconstruction and Jim Crow South.

What distinguishes America is how this Nation responds to such lawless and purposeful attacks. We hold, it is declared, that government's very purpose is to secure the inalienable rights of all of us and that, when order falls apart, so, too, does our Nation.

What we have seen in recent weeks begs the question: How is government serving its core purpose?

Local and State officials have flouted that purpose, abandoned that responsibility. But in those circumstances, the Federal Government has the tools to secure the rights of the people.

Attorney General Barr, chapter 13 of the United States Criminal Code, provides all the authority you may need. FBI Director Wray, the evidence of criminal conspiracies is in plain sight.

The Department of Justice and the FBI must act without delay. This government must restore the America we know.

Word is the Department of Justice is leading over 500 investigations, and that is good news. We are counting on them, and we know they are up to the task.

Mr. BIGGS. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from North Carolina for his comments, and I echo his sentiment that what needs to happen to restore order here is one must arrest malefactors who are committing crimes. We must then charge them and prosecute them and give them due process. But without a restoration of order, no one in this country has freedom.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WEBER).

Mr. WEBER of Texas. Madam Speaker, some history from our country.

Yesterday was June 25. On June 25, 1788, the State of Virginia ratified the U.S. Constitution and thereby became the 10th State of the United States. Virginia willingly joined the Union. Virginia willingly left the Union and then willingly eventually rejoined the Union, a reminder from our past. Do we take down everything about Virginia? Certainly not.

Madam Speaker, on June 25, 1868, Florida, Alabama, Louisiana, Georgia, North Carolina, and South Carolina were readmitted to the Union. Again, they had willingly joined the Union; they willingly left the Union; and, yes, they willingly rejoined that same Union. Reminders from the past. Do we do away with all reminders?

On May 18, 1896, the Supreme Court in Plessy v. Ferguson upheld the constitutionality of racial segregation for public facilities as long as they were separate but equal. In 1962, the Supreme Court ruled that the use of unofficial nondenominational prayer in public schools was unconstitutional. They got it wrong twice, just two examples. Do we do away with any mention of the Supreme Court?

Madam Speaker, in 1973, June 25, again, yesterday, John Dean, White House Counsel for President Richard Nixon, admitted that President Nixon was involved in the coverup. Do we do away with all mention of President Nixon?

Madam Speaker, how about President Bill Clinton, who was accused of several sexual harassments and was found guilty of lying under oath and, as I recall, tampering with a witness or obstruction of justice? Are all mentions of President Clinton gone? No, not him, not Nixon. They were Presidents of this United States.

Madam Speaker, in 1999, on June 25, Germany's Parliament approved a national Holocaust memorial to be built in Berlin, a painful but necessary reminder from the past.

And we could go on. We could talk about professional entertainers—and I use the word ''professional'' loosely—who have been accused. And the list is Bill Cosby, Harvey Weinstein, and on down. You go right down that list. Do we demand any and all of their works, their mentions, their movies, their shows be blotted out from memory?

We could talk about professional athletes—and again, I use the word ''professional'' loosely—who have been accused of sexual assault, beating their wives up, their girlfriends up, caught with drugs, performance-enhancing drugs, gambling, cheating. Do we blot them out from all memory and all mentions? No.

Madam Speaker, even churches—the Catholic Church, the Baptist Church, the Methodists, other churches, other denominations—scandals, military sex scandals, Boy Scouts, congressional sex scandals, every occupation, every race, color, creed, and religion, none is perfect. Where does it end?

Should we pull down and attempt to erase all mentions of countries like Japan, Germany, France, Spain, Italy, China? The list is endless.

Madam Speaker, George Floyd had a criminal record, but he did not deserve execution at the hands of an errant police officer. And then again, those whose lives and/or their livelihoods are being destroyed by vandals, looters, and rioters don't deserve to have their families and their livelihoods and their lives ruined either.

It is time for the violence to stop. Peaceful protests, yes; violence, no. The Governors and the President should send in troops when requested and needed. I stand with the President in that.

These criminals and lawbreakers deserve to be dealt with in a manner consistent with their behavior and the law. They are pulling down statues that were paid for with tax dollars, erected with the consent of the governed, no matter what community or timeframe. These thugs simply think they can tear them down.

Do we acknowledge there are those who have an improper mindset? Of course. Those are thugs tearing things down. Of course we do.

Do we also acknowledge that Black lives matter? You bet we do. I cannot even begin to understand the fear of parents and their children who live in that fear that some day they may suffer that same fate.

But let's have that conversation within the framework of a civilized people who earnestly desire what President Lincoln called ''a more perfect Union.''

Violence, property destruction, vandalism, arson, looting, and, yes, killing others is hardly what I think we would want or call a more perfect Union, Madam Speaker.

So how about a new reset? Looking backwards will only leave us hating everyone and everything. Statues and symbols of our great country should remind us how far we have come, but, more importantly, how far we have got to go still.

We should be taking pride in how far we have come. Actually, let us hope in the promises of where we can go, while being saddened as to some of the things that have had to happen to get us to this point.

Madam Speaker, how about a reset?

□ 1745

George Orwell once said:

The most effective way to destroy people is to deny and obliterate their own understanding of their history.

Madam Speaker, as we reassess our shared experience, let us learn from the past in order to make a better, brighter future. America's history is imperfect. But projecting contemporary norms through violence while rejecting the experiences of our past does a disservice to the sacrifices of the great men and women like President Lincoln, who fought for equality for all.

We must not erase our history. We must learn from it. This is one of the promises and the highest callings of America the beautiful.

Mr. BIGGS. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments, particularly relating to history. I am reminded, as I was pondering that, that each of us has a history. Each of us has a personal history. None of us are perfect. Sometimes, we have flaws that seem almost insurmountable in our own lives. But if we deny our history,

then we deny who we are and who we can become.

When I hear folks out there attacking our history and saying, let's bring down this statue or let's do this or let's do that, some of it is so acontextual. By that, I mean it is as if there was no history to learn from. And I think, how in the world can we be so narcissistic that we don't accept the flaws of our own past and build upon the promise of the future?

We have problems, for sure, but it does not inure to lawlessness, rioting, murder, and mayhem. It should, instead, inure to the better angels within us.

Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA).

Mr. LAMALFA. Madam Speaker, I appreciate my colleague from Arizona (Mr. BIGGS) for leading this tonight and for what he has been standing up for.

I just have to say that I am really grieved by the strife we have in this country, especially trying to exit out of this Wuhan virus situation and the horrific things we saw happening in Minneapolis. That was the moment when we saw George Floyd being abused and ultimately killed by that.

There was unity among 99.9 percent of the population of the people in this country saying that is wrong. We had a moment to learn from that, to build upon that.

Indeed, it seemed to be a short moment. Peaceful protests immediately followed. We agree with those. And then that has been co-opted by these forces coming out of the ground that have been looking for an opportunity to divide us, divide our Nation, whether it is antifa or other groups that are forming and now seeking political power with this. It is now beyond racism. It is something completely different.

The violence that we are seeing, the mayhem, the destruction, the vandalism has nothing to do with the good conversation we should have been having in that spirit of unity that I think most Americans felt in that window of time right after the George Floyd killing.

How are we going to come out of this? How are we going to have a good conversation about how we can improve things with law enforcement but not impugn law enforcement for what they are doing? They are out there every day trying to find the balance between how to defend the public, how to defend their own life when they knock on a door or walk up to a car—they don't know what is going on inside there—and also being a good ambassador for somebody who they just need to talk to.

How are we going to find this balance again amidst all of this mayhem, amidst all of this violence? Well, certainly, the signal needs to be sent that we are not going to tolerate the violence, the mayhem, the destruction, the vandalism. Severe penalties need to be coming down upon those who we already have on camera or other ways to identify in anything going forward.

I just came from Lincoln Park about 10 blocks east of here, and they have to put fencing and have guards out there for the statue of Abraham Lincoln, who is shown there putting a hand up for a slave depicted in that statue, an emancipated slave. He is still wearing the chains. He is looking up at Mr. Lincoln, who is lifting him and going to take him to a better place.

Yet, that is being misinterpreted in 2020 as something that is hateful. That same statue was paid for by emancipated slaves back then who were inspired by what Mr. Lincoln had done.

They even have a fence around Mary McLeod Bethune right next-door because they are afraid that might get vandalized because there is indiscriminate vandalism happening to any statue, to any memorial, to any monument just because it is a mayhem out there.

That doesn't even make sense. It is not even logical that you would tear down the ones, General Grant or whoever, who were actually in the fight to end slavery. We are not going to have a very good conversation about racism when frauds like this go on.

Even something so simple or silly as a garage at a raceway here a while back where somebody said it was a noose in the garage, and the media ran with it immediately without taking at least 12 hours to check out and find out that it was a pull handle for shutting a garage door. In no way does it meet the specifications for a noose. Unfortunately, the driver doubled down on that and continued in interviews saying definitely a noose.

That doesn't do anything to bring the harmony we should be having, especially when that driver was shown an incredible amount of harmony by his colleagues there when first that incident was reported.

Where are we going with all of this? I grieve for our country, the one that had imperfect roots but always has strived to build upon itself to do better, to improve.

Slavery came in with the country, but the Founders knew it wasn't right. There were compromises made to at least form this country to be something better than the monarchy that England had, compromises but still building until finally in the 1860s when Mr. Lincoln came and said enough. You had more than half the country that was already ready to do that.

We don't get a lot of talk about that because you think the whole country was racist. Most of the country was not. It was eradicated. Then we had the 13th, 14th, and 15th Amendments to grant rights to those who originally did not have them. The Civil Rights Act of the 1960s continued on that path, the Voting Rights Act.

Yet, all we hear around here is, Republicans are against all that, when you find out that, actually, Republicans were leading in greater numbers on all of those things all the way back at that time. Now, Democrats are trying to co-opt that and turn it into something else completely. Indeed, the first 20 Members of Congress who were Black were also Republican because they saw who was really trying to lead them toward freedom.

What we have going on right now is not going to keep this great country in a place that is free. We have lost a lot of freedom already by the virus, first—something we have to handle—but also the freedom to actually assemble downtown in a large city or to go visit a statue or do anything.

Our freedoms are being eroded. Our freedoms are being eroded by roving bands of people who—mayors in large cities, Democrat mayors, and some Democrat Governors that govern States aren't doing anything about it.

What are we supposed to do? Stand and watch what is going on here? No, we are not going to watch this anymore. We are not going to put up with it. Severe penalties need to be had for these people inflicting this mayhem upon their own Nation, upon their own neighbors, upon neighborhoods. It needs to be harsh.

Then, once we can get the violence stopped, maybe we can get back to the table and have a real conversation about how we are going to improve the situations with race.

It grieves me that young Black males feel like they are going to be victimized by the term ''driving while Black.'' That is an awful feeling for them and for us, I think, to see that happen.

Our great colleague over on the other side, Senator TIM SCOTT, when he brought forth a bill he has been working on very hard for a long time, looking for bipartisan efforts, his JUSTICE Act, and then someone tells him it is a token effort.

What the heck does that mean? That really struck him deeply, that people would say that about that and not even give him the opportunity to have that bill developed further in the Senate. What a shameful moment that was.

Yet, now we have legislation here that is trying to eviscerate the ability of cops to operate how they need to, to have a little bit of immunity because a cop doesn't know what he is walking into or what she is walking into. They need a little latitude, not the latitude we saw in Minneapolis, but one to simply operate.

Doctors need latitude in order to work on patients and not be sued to death. Yet, we have this legislation that is going to be, basically, sue a cop. That is not going to help anything.

What is that going to do for morale for keeping cops on the force, for recruiting new ones? Do we want this mayhem we keep seeing happening right here in D.C., Minneapolis, L.A., any other large city, and we don't have some kind of law enforcement there?

Social workers do have their place in certain situations, and they can be

helpful. But we don't take money away. We don't defund the cops who are already shorthanded in rural areas like mine, sheriffs, police, in order to try and change the whole game.

We have a lot of listening to do to each other on both sides. Not everybody with light-colored skin is a racist, and I think a lot of people around this country are really feeling, after the unity we had, after the George Floyd ugly incident in Minneapolis, this is a time to get together and listen to each other.

If this is allowed to continue to happen, it is going to make it awful hard for people to listen to each other because they are feeling under fire themselves for something they never did, never stood for. Instead, they have always stood for the greatness of that flag right up there. In God we trust.

I appreciate the time.

Mr. BIGGS. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for his passionate and heartfelt words.

It is my pleasure now to yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. POSEY).

Mr. POSEY. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

''We want America back.'' Those were just a few of the lyrics of a song written by a group named The Steeles in 1996. Some of the lyrics said:

Something is wrong with America.
This Nation is like a runaway train,
Headed down the wrong track.

And it concludes, in part, with:

I love America. But I do not love what she has become.

Circumstances seemed pretty despairing back then, but they pale in comparison to what we are seeing going on across our country today, perpetrated by Marxists, anarchists, and those malcontents who are funding them.

Today, the miscreants are using George Floyd's death to neuter the ability of the police to enforce the law. So far, they have been successful in getting the police out of the way.

Without law enforcement, their mobs are free to move in, smash businesses, injure people, and cause chaos. Those aren't peaceful protesters, and they are not peaceful protests.

Their outcry for justice makes sympathetic, or perhaps even cowardly, corporations and stupid movie stars send money to them. Now they are tearing down the statues, intimidating the public and politicians into accepting their farfetched demands, and giving them even more power.

Circumstances are advantageous for them right now because we are in the midst of a pandemic so they have a freer rein of the streets.

Who could have ever imagined sanctuary cities where America's rule of law is ruefully ignored by government officials?

Who would have ever imagined some elected officials would allow domestic terrorists or wannabe revolutionaries to commandeer a complete takeover and rule of both public and private property and have dominion over other unwilling citizens of the United States in so-called autonomous zones.

Give me a break.

Then, the lawbreakers have the audacity to demand our police be defunded or reimagined, whatever the heck that means. It sounds insane.

It is really a campaign to drive our duly-elected President Donald Trump from office. Anyone who stands in their way they think should be destroyed.

We can expect it to get worse and worse until November 3, when they hope to put an end to the prosperity created by the President. You have to suffer from the world's worst case of Potomac fever, or beltway brain drain, to think they are fooling anybody.

Meanwhile, the leadership and majority in this Chamber have been silent. I have not heard a single word, syllable, or letter uttered by them in opposition to the miscreants. It is past time for them to condemn their activities, and it is time for law enforcement across this Nation in every State, in every county, in every city, in every little burgh, community, and the rural areas in-between to put an end to this lawlessness.

If you don't start acting soon, there wouldn't be anything left to tear down. I would like to take a bunch of these wannabe revolutionaries to South or Central America for a few days to see how their game would end if they were successful in having it their way.

□ 1800

If you have ever traveled throughout those socialist countries there, it is a very eye-opening experience. The State Department, and even their own officials, warn you, don't wear any jewelry; don't carry much cash, because there is a good chance you are going to get robbed. And if you are approached by a robber, hand over everything, hold back nothing, because they would just as soon shoot you and kill you as not shoot you and kill you.

There is a lot of lawlessness, and they don't fear justice. They don't fear the police. They are going to take, and you are going to give, or you are going to die. And you know what the State Department and the local officials tell you next? If you get robbed, don't call the police. It is not like in our country where, if there is a problem, you call the police. There, they tell you not to call the police because they are all corrupt and they will shake you down for anything the robbers missed.

One common denominator of the countries that I visited, which was Brazil, French Guiana, Suriname, and Trinidad, was a common denominator that every single house that I saw, large or small, urban or suburban, no matter how far out you went into the country, every single house that was more than a cardboard box had bars on every window and most of the doors. Why? Because that is what lawlessness brings.

They truly go to bed every night in those socialist countries with the expectation that if they did not have bars, they wouldn't wake up in the morning; or if they did, every possession that they had that was worth anything would be gone.

Very little police, high crime, high unemployment, bars on all the windows. Is that what we really want for our future?

We have been blessed to live in the land of opportunity, the most free and prosperous nation in the history of the world. Many, many, many people have risked their lives and the lives of their wives, their grandparents, their parents, their children, family members to come here. This place is really that good that people would risk their life just to come here, a chance at coming here. We cannot stand back and let it be destroyed. We want America back.

Mr. BIGGS. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his thoughts and taking time to share those with us.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOHO).

Mr. YOHO. Madam Speaker, I thank my good colleague from Arizona (Mr. BIGGS) for putting this on. I really do appreciate it because it is so timely.

Growing pains, I think that is what we can say we are going through is growing pains again as a nation, a nation birthed over 200 years ago.

And for anybody who watched yesterday's debate, Madam Speaker, on the House floor, I think it was interesting to see the amount of, I guess, race-baiting that was coming from the other side, from my colleagues, which I found very unreasonable that, for some reason, if you are a Black man, you have to tell your children how to act with the police.

My mom and dad had that talk with me, probably for good reason, too, and they said: If you get pulled over, ''Yes, sir,'' ''No, sir,'' and then when you get home we want to know what happened and why you got pulled over. I had to have that talk with my children. So that is nothing new, and I think that we sometimes overplay that.

Does it happen maybe more with minority communities? Yes, I think it does, but nobody is immune to that. When I came into Congress, I got stopped multiple times to see if I had the right credentials. That has happened to me.

Since we have been up here, the divide in this country has gotten so much worse, and it has been since Donald Trump has gotten elected. And people will blame the President for doing this, but we can go back to other Presidents where we have seen this happen. We are Americans. We need to come together as a nation.

I have had the great fortune of being in Congress. This is my last term. I will have served 8 years. I was the chairman of the Asia-Pacific Subcommittee last year, last Congress; I am the ranking member this year. I have bean able to travel the world. I have been in the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

Africa is a continent of 1.2 billion, yet today, in the 21st century, 650 million people do not have electricity. I suppose they have a reason to protest. I suppose they have a reason to complain. But do they have the right to protest?

Being on the Asia-Pacific Subcommittee we got to travel to a lot of the Asian countries. We all know what is going on in Hong Kong today. Hong Kong is a province of China. There was an agreement of one country, two systems, where Hong Kong was supposed to be a semi- or a self-ruling area with an independent judiciary committee. Yet, 23 years into that agreement, Xi Jinping, the leader of the Communist Party, said that is null and void, and they have put the heavy hand of the Communist Party in there.

These young students are out there holding up that flag behind you, Madam Speaker, holding up that flag for liberty and freedom because they have tasted that. That is all they have ever known. Yet the Chinese Communist Party wants to take that away because it scares them. Free thought, independent thinking, freedom, they know the Communist Party cannot survive, so they are going in there to squash that.

These students are holding those signs up. Our flag is up. They have been in my office here in the Washington Capitol. They have a reason to protest, but they do not have the right.

You talk about Venezuela, somebody talked about it. Go down to Cuba and talk against the Castro regime. You don't have the right. Talk about religion in those countries. You do not have the right.

But then I look at this country, and I am as guilty as anybody else in this country. We have the right to protest, the First Amendment, but sometimes I think—and this is where I feel like I am guilty, like a lot of us. I think we take it for granted what we have in this country.

It was interesting because I was with the Ambassadors of both Malaysia and Indonesia, and they talked about the founding of their country. When they got their independence, when they broke away and they formed those countries, they told me that their founding fathers could have picked any system in the world. They could have taken Great Britain's system of government. They could have taken Germany's, Russia's, China's. But you know who they took? They took the principles of America because they had read our history, they had read those documents and what those documents meant.

And I heard people over and over here today, since I have been in Congress, America is not a perfect country because people are in it, and people are not perfect, but the ideals laid out there were the best ideals that have ever been laid out. If not, why are other countries adopting them? Why do people in Cuba come across the ocean, a 90-mile stretch, on inner tubes, on rafts, on surfboards to get to this country? It is called freedom. It is called justice.

But do you know what? We are not going to fix it if this side is accusing this side, and this side over here is accusing that side of pandering to our audience.

So what that meant to me when I was with those Ambassadors from Indonesia and Malaysia, what it meant to me was: Do you know what? America is bigger than a Presidency. It is bigger than the Democratic Party. It is bigger than the Republican Party. It is those ideals that this country stands for that we all need to fight to hold on to.

I want to read something that one of my constituents sent me. It says: ''The lesson taught at this point by human experience is simply this, that the man who will get up will be helped up, and the man who will not get up will be allowed to stay down. . . . Personal independence is a virtue and it is the soul of which comes the sturdiest manhood. But there can be no independence without a large share of self-dependence, and this virtue cannot be bestowed. It must be developed from within.''

I had an African-American man, a conservative Republican who is afraid to tell people he is a conservative Republican because he gets labeled Uncle Tom. You have been put on the plantation.

These are not my words. These are words coming from him.

But that quote came from somebody I wish we could go back and meet, Mr. Frederick Douglass, a person born into slavery who picked himself up by the bootstraps, who educated himself. He stood beside President Lincoln when they dedicated the Emancipation statue.

And I have got these people out here who loathe, despise, disdain this country, and it is being flamed by people—and I can't blame just people, the Democrats. There are people out there who just hate this country, but they are using that to tear this country apart instead of remembering the ideals that this country is built on. And those are American ideologies—not conservative, not liberal, not Republican or Democrat, American—and I think it is time that we all come together and realize we are Americans and we are on the same team.

Mr. BIGGS. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his passionate comments about freedom.

Madam Speaker, those of us who have had the good fortune of studying history, we know that it bumps and claws along. We do see progress sometimes, and we also see devolution sometimes.

What we are seeing today, though, reminds me an awful lot of a revolution that took place in the early part of the 20th century. It was not a large revolution; it was a small revolution. It was the Bolshevik Revolution. It was funded by some of the bourgeoisie who did not like the form of government in then-Russia. It was not a massive revolution. It wasn't widespread, but it changed that entire nation's form of government.

I am reminded that it was Trotsky who prevented the military from intervening against the lawless revolution. What I am seeing here today reminds me an awful lot of that. This is a small revolution that is violent in nature, is anti-American in nature.

And so when my colleagues mention the police and what they need to do, what happens is there has been an emasculation of the police. They don't really want to get involved because, should they get involved, there is a legitimate concern that they will be sued, arrested, et cetera. So when you get rid of the blue line of defense against lawlessness, then you basically destroy the foundation of the protection of your freedoms.

President Trump called certain groups antifa, domestic terrorists. In our debate in the Judiciary Committee, some of my colleagues said antifa is a fiction. So I said: Well, you know, is it a fiction?

So I went to CNN, because I knew that if I went to FOX and referred to FOX, nobody was going to believe that that was not biased. So I went to CNN because I wanted to find out what they said, and you can go through and find extensive interviews where the conclusion is clear: antifa is a real organization. It is a group. And the group sometimes chooses to resort to violence.

So what do you have? They are definitely domestic. They are committing terrorist activity in this country. Thus, they are domestic.

And what would terrorism be? Terrorism is the use of force, intimidation, violence to change or alter behavior for a particular purpose.

So you begin to see you have domestic terrorism going on.

□ 1815

18 U.S. Code, Section 2339A, I call on FBI Director Wray to begin using that statute, make the arrests necessary to restore order. And I call on Attorney General William Barr to use that same section to charge and prosecute these individuals who are attempting to intimidate Americans out of their freedom.

A lot of these Federal monuments and statues that are coming down, these memorials that are being ripped to shreds, destroyed are on Federal property.

And you know what? 18 U.S. Code 1369 is the statute that Director Wray should be having his Federal agency make arrests under. And then I call on Attorney General Barr to have his U.S. attorneys charge and prosecute under 18 U.S. Code 1369 for destruction of veterans' memorials. And we can go forward.

But why do I even bring that up? It is because I believe sincerely that this country is built on the idea that each

of us should have agency, will, choice. It hasn't always worked out really well or perfectly. There are those who have had their choices and will taken away from them. That is inexcusable, of course.

But if we are going to have will and choice and freedom, then we are part of this great social contract where I delegate my right to defend myself because I can't do it all the time. There are people who are stronger or more vicious or are more malevolent who want to compel me to do something or take something from me.

We delegate police authority to police. It is not carte blanche. It is reasonable.

We have got to restore respect for the law, for the police, for the courts, and for process.

It is imperfect. I worked in that system for a lot of years on both sides, prosecuting and defending. It is not a perfect process.

The reality is, though, it is as Winston Churchill said, Democracy is the worst form of government except for all those others.

It is the best humankind has come up with.

To destroy our history seems so antithetical to making progress, eradicating our history, erasing it.

College professors are now saying we have got to go through and remove books from the library.

Remove them from the library, because why? They have unpopular ideas in them. They may be unpopular ideas, but you know what is better than taking them out and burning them or removing them and trashing them ala Adolph Hitler and the Nazis? It is letting us read them, discuss them, and point out their flaws, and rehabilitate us, our hearts.

Artwork being removed from museums, being removed from this House. Why? Because some were not 2020 politically correct. What they did was, to some, unconscionable and abominable. Let's have the discussion.

Removing your history allows you to repeat the mistakes of your history. I simply don't understand it.

We have now moved beyond a motivational or some kind of philosophical attempt to remove historical items. Now we are seeing indiscriminate action.

Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD a series of articles.

[From Breitbart News]

A greater percentage of U.S. registered voters believe Confederate statues, which have been targeted by protesters in recent weeks, should remain standing despite activists' demands to remove them, a Morning Consult poll released this week revealed.

The survey, taken June 6–7, showed that a greater number of Americans believe Confederate statues should remain standing, 44 percent, as opposed to the 32 percent who say they should be removed. Twenty-three percent expressed no opinion on the matter.

The fundings reflect a slight shift in opinion over the last three years. In August 2017, 52 percent of voters indicated that the statues should be left alone, with just over a quarter, 26 percent, indicating otherwise.

However, Morning Consult reported that the purported increase in support over the years is largely driven by Democrats:

The rise in support for removing the statues was driven by Democrats, a majority of whom now take that position, and independents, who still favor keeping those statues standing by a 10–point margin. Eleven percent of GOP voters say the statues should be removed, virtually unchanged since 2017.

The vast majority of Republicans, 71 percent, believe the Confederate statues should remain standing, whereas the majority of Democrats, 53 percent, believe they should be taken down. Forty percent of independents believe they should remain standing, with 30 percent vying for their removal and 30 percent expressing no opinion.

The survey was taken among ''roughly'' 1,900 voters, with a margin of error of +/- two percent.

The survey comes as protesters vandalize and, in some cases, tear down Confederate statues and others they deem offensive, including statues of Christopher Columbus.

House Speaker Nancy Pelosi (D–CA) has also embraced the calls for change, requesting in a letter on Wednesday the removal of Confederate statues occupying the U.S. Capitol, or as she called them, ''monuments to men who advocated cruelty and barbarism to achieve such a plainly racist end.''

''Monuments to men who advocated cruelty and barbarism to achieve such a plainly racist end are a grotesque affront to these ideals,'' she said in a letter to Committee Chair Roy Blunt (R–MO) and Vice Chair Zoe Lofgren (D–CA). ''Their statues pay homage to hate, not heritage. They must be removed.''

Interestingly, Pelosi has remained silent on her own father's role in the dedication of a Confederate statue in Baltimore's Wyman Park in 1948.

As Breitbart News detailed:

However, her father, Thomas D'Alesandro, Jr., oversaw the dedication of such a statue in Baltimore's Wyman Park—the Stonewall Jackson and Robert E. Lee Monument—as mayor of the city in 1948. At the time, the Speaker's father said people could look to Jackson's and Lee's lives as inspiration and urged Americans to ''emulate Jackson's example and stand like a stone wall against aggression in any form that would seek to destroy the liberty of the world.''

World Wars I and II found the North and South fighting for a common cause, and the generalship and military science displayed by these two great men in the War between the States lived on and were applied in the military plans of our nation in Europe and the Pacific areas,'' D'Alesandro said at the dedication ceremony, as detailed by the Baltimore Sun. He continued:

Today with our nation beset by subversive groups and propaganda which seeks to destroy our national unity, we can look for inspiration to the lives of Lee and Jackson to remind us to be resolute and determined in preserving our sacred institutions . . . remain steadfast in our determination to preserve freedom, not only for ourselves, but for other liberty-loving nations who are striving to preserve their national unity as free nations.

Pelosi's office did not return Breitbart News's request for comment.

[From Fox News, Aug. 21, 2018]

WHICH CONFEDERATE STATUES WERE REMOVED? A RUNNING LIST

(By Christopher Carbone)

More than 30 cities across the United States have removed or relocated Confederate statues and monuments amid an intense nationwide debate about race and history.

After a ''Unite the Right'' rally in Virginia in August to protest against the removal of a statue of Robert E. Lee resulted in the death of a woman who was demonstrating against white supremacy, other cities have decided to remove Confederate statues.

Many of the controversial monuments were dedicated in the early twentieth century or during the height of the Civil Rights Movement. Discussions are under way about the removal of monuments in Houston, Atlanta, Nashville, Pensacola, Florida, Jacksonville, Florida, Richmond, Virginia, Birmingham, Alabama, and Charlottesville, Virginia.

Here is a running list of all the monuments and statues that have been removed and the cities that have taken them down:

ANNAPOLIS, MD.

Under cover of darkness, city workers removed a statue in August 2017 of former Supreme Court Justice Roger Taney that had been on the State House's front lawn for 145 years. Taney authored the Supreme Court's 1857 Dred Scott decision, which held that African-Americans could not be U.S. citizens. The city's Republican mayor said through a spokesman that it was removed ''as a matter of public safety.''

AUSTIN, TEXAS

The statues of four people with ties to the Confederacy—Robert E. Lee, Albert Sidney Johnson, John H. Reagan and former Texas Gov. James Stephen Hogg—were removed from pedestals on the University of Texas campus on Aug. 17, 2017. UT's president said in a written statement the deadly clashes in Charlottesville made it clear ''Confederate monuments have become symbols of modern white supremacy and neo-Nazism.'' Separately, a 1,200–pound bronze statue of Confederate President Jefferson Davis that was removed from UT's campus in 2015 has now returned to the campus, at the Briscoe Center for American History.

The Austin school board voted to strip Confederate names from five district schools, though they haven't been renamed yet. The board had previously renamed Robert E. Lee Elementary School in 2016.

The Austin City Council approved renaming Robert E. Lee Road and Jeff Davis Avenue.

BALTIMORE, MD.

Baltimore Mayor Catherine Pugh told reporters she wanted to move ''quickly and quietly'' to take down four Confederate statues or monuments—statues of Lee and Thomas, J. ''Stonewall'' Jackson and monuments for Confederate Soldiers and Sailors and Confederate Women—from the city's public spaces. Although the plan had been in the works since June 2017, the Baltimore City Council approved it only two days after the deadly events in Charlottesville. On March 10, 2018, the space where the Confederate statues had stood was rededicated to abolitionist and civil rights pioneer Harriet Tubman.

BRADENTON, FLA.

Mantee County removed a Confederate soldiers memorial obelisk on Aug. 24 after the city commission voted 4–3 to take it down and place it in storage. The monument, which had stood there for more than 90 years, was accidentally broken into two pieces when city workers removed it. The removal came after days of protests from residents and activists, most of whom were in favor of taking it down, and it cost $12,700 to remove.

BROOKLYN, N.Y.

Plaques honoring Lee were removed from an episcopal church's property on Aug. 16,

2017 and the governor called on the Army to remove the names of Lee and another Confederate general from the streets around a nearby fort. ''It was very easy for us to say, 'OK, we'll take the plaques down,''' said Bishop Lawrence Provenzano, of the Episcopal Diocese of Long Island, who called them ''offensive to the community.'' New York City Mayor Bill de Blasio has called for a review of all the city's public art to identify ''symbols of hate'' for possible removal.

DALLAS, TEXAS

A bronze statue of Robert E. Lee, formally called the Robert Edward Lee Sculpture, was removed in mid-September 2017 from Robert E. Lee Park, which was also named in honor of the Confederate general. The Dallas City Council voted 13–1 to remove the statue, which has stood in Lee Park for 81 years.

The park was dedicated to Lee by President Franklin Delano Roosevelt in 1936 during a renaming ceremony of the park.

DAYTONA BEACH, FLA.

Three Confederate monuments were removed from a city park Friday morning. A city spokesperson said the plaques were going to be cleaned up and taken to a nearby museum. The decision to remove them did not require public input, the spokes-person told FOX35, because they were donated and not purchased with taxpayer funds.

CHAPEL HILL, N.C.

Protesters toppled the ''Silent Sam'' statue that has stood on the University of North Carolina's Chapel Hill campus since 1913 on Aug. 20. More than 200 people had gathered and were chanting ''hey, hey, ho, ho, this racist statue has got to go.'' In a statement, UNC Chancellor Carol Folt called the act ''unlawful and dangerous,'' adding that law enforcement were investigating the incident. The statue had been a source of controversy, with school officials claiming that state law prevented them from removing it.

DURHAM, N.C.

A nearly-century old statue of a Confederate soldier was toppled not long after Charlottesville by protesters associated with the Workers World party. North Carolina Central University student Takiyah Thompson, along with three others, were arrested and charged with felonies in the days following. As the bronze statue lay crumpled on the ground, protesters could be seen kicking it on social media. A Worthington assistant city manager said the community seeks to be one that ''promotes tolerance, respect and inclusion.''

A statue of Lee was removed from the entrance to Duke University Chapel on Aug. 19, 2017 and is set to be preserved in some way to study the university's ''complex past.''

''I took this course of action to protect Duke Chapel, to ensure the vital safety of students and community members who worship there, and above all to express the deep and abiding values of our university,'' university President Vincent Price wrote in statement to the school.

FRANKLIN, OHIO

A monument to Lee was removed in August 2017 by Franklin workers. Gainesville, Fla.

A chapter of the United Daughters of the Confederacy paid for the removal of a monument to Confederate soldiers known locally as ''Old Joe'' that stood in front a building in downtown Gainesville for 113 years. It was moved to a private cemetery outside the city in August 2017.

HELENA, MONT.

The state's capital city on Aug. 18, 2017 removed a memorial to Confederate soldiers that had been in a public park since 1916. The granite fountain, which was dismantled, had been donated by the United Daughters of the Confederacy. City Parks and Recreation Director Amy Teegarden told the Spokesman-Review that the fountain initially will be stored in a city warehouse—but it could be reassembled at a future date.

KANSAS CITY, MO.

A Confederate monument was boxed up in summer 2017 and is slated to be removed. The Missouri division of the United Daughters of the Confederacy had asked Kansas City Parks and Recreation to find a new home for it.

LEXINGTON, KY.

Two 130-year-old Confederate statues were removed from downtown Lexington on October 18 after the state's attorney general issued an opinion giving the city permission to take them down and move them to a private cemetery. Lexington used private funds to take the statues, of Confederate General John Hunt Morgan and John Breckinridge, a former U.S. Vice President and the last Confederate Secretary of War. Private funds will cover the cost of their upkeep in the cemetery.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

A large stone monument commemorating Confederate veterans was taken down Aug. 16 from the Hollywood Forever Cemetery after hundreds of people demanded its removal. The 6-foot granite marker was loaded into a pickup truck and taken to a storage facility. A petition calling for it to be taken down had garnered 1,3000 signatures.

LOUISVILLE, KY.

A statue of a Confederate soldier was removed from the University of Louisville campus after a legal battle between the city residents, the mayor and the Sons of Confederate Veterans. It was relocated to Brandenburg, Kentucky, which hosts Civil War Reenactments.

MADISON, WIS.

A plaque honoring Confederate soldiers were removed Aug. 17 from a cemetery not long after residents and city leaders began calling for it to be taken down. ''The Civil War was an act of insurrection and treason and a defense of the deplorable practice of slavery,'' said Mayor Paul Soglin in a statement. ''The monuments in question were connected to that action and we do not need them on city property.''

MEMPHIS, TENN.

Crews removed two Confederate statues from Memphis parks on Dec. 20 after the city sold them to a private entity. The City Council voted unanimously earlier in the day to sell both Health Sciences and fourth Bluff Parks where the Confederate statues, of Confederate General Nathan Bedford Forrest and Confederate President Jefferson Davis, were located.

NASHVILLE, TENN.

The Legendary Ryman Auditorium, where stars like Dolly Parton, Patsy Cline and Loretta Lynn made their Grand Ole Opry debuts, quietly moved a sign on Sept 21 hanging the venue's upper level that read ''1897 Confederate Gallery.'' Honoring an 1897 reunion of Confederate veterans at the Ryman, the sign had been shrouded over the years but has now been permanently removed from the main auditorium and added to a museum exhibit that explains the history of the 125-year-old music hall.

NEW ORLEANS, LA.

New Orleans city workers removed four monuments in April dedicated to the Confederacy and opponents of Reconstruction. The city council had declared the monuments a public nuisance. The monuments removed were of Confederate General P.G.T. Beauregard, Davis and Lee. Also removed was the Liberty Place Monument, which commemorated a Reconstruction Era white supremacist attack on the city's integrated police force. The mayor plans to replace with new fountains and an American flag.

NEW YORK, N.Y.

Busts of Lee and Jackson were removed overnight on Aug. 17 from the Hall of Fame for Great Americans at Bronx Community College. Prior to its removal, Bro x Borough president Ruben Siaz Jr. had said ''there is nothing great about two men who committed treason against the United States to fight to keep the institution of slavery in tact.''

ORLANDO, FLA.

A Confederate statue known as ''Johnny Reb'' was moved in June 2017 by officials from Lake Eola Park to Greenwood Cemetery in response to public outcry about it being symbolic of hate and white supremacy. A spokesperson for Orlando's mayor told Fox News that city officials are working with historians on a new inscription to put the monument ''in proper historical perspective.''

RICHMOND, VA.

The Richmond school board voted 6–1 on June 18, 2018 to rename J.E.B. Stuart Elementary School to Barack Obama Elementary School. The process began several months prior and involved input from students, teachers, administrators and local stakeholders. Virginia is home to the largest number of Confederate monuments and symbols in the country.

ROCKVILLE, MD.

A 13-ton bronze Confederate statue that had stood for decades next to Rockville's Red Brick Courthouse was relocated in July next to a privately run Potomac River ferry named for a Confederate general. The relocation cost about $100,000, according to the Washington Post.

SAN DIEGO, CALIF.

A plaque honoring Davis was quietly removed Aug. 16, 2017 from a downtown park. ''This morning I ordered the immediate removal of a plaque honoring the Confederacy at Horton Plaza Park,'' Mayor Kevin

Faulconer told the Los Angeles Times. ''San Diegans stand together against Confederate symbols of division.''

SAN ANTONIO, TEXAS

A Confederate statue was removed from Travis Park overnight Sept. 1, 2017 after the City Council voted 10–1 in favor of taking it down the previous day. There were no protesters during or after the removal, according to local media reports. ''This is, without context, a monument that glorifies the causes of the Confederacy, and that's not something that a modern city needs to have in a public square,'' said San Antonio Mayor Ron Nirenberg following the council vote.

SAN ANTONIO, TEXAS

A Jefferson Davis highway marker was removed in 2016.

ST. LOUIS, MO.

The Missouri Civil War Museum oversaw the removal in late June 2017 of a 32-foot granite and bronze monument from Forest Park, where it had stood for 103 years. It shouldered the costs of removal and will hold the monument in storage until a new home can be found for it. The agreement stipulates the monument can be re-displayed at a Civil War museum, battlefield or cemetery. In Boone County, a rock with a plaque honoring Confederate soldiers that had been removed from the University of Missouri campus was relocated a second time after the Charleston AEM church massacre to a historic site commemorating a nearby Civil War battle.

ST. PETERSBURG, FLA.

St. Petersburg Mayor Rick Kriseman ordered city workers to remove a bronze Confederate marker at noon on Aug. 15, 2017 after determining that it was on city property. It's being held in storage until a new home can be found for it. ''The plaque recognizing a highway named after Stonewall Jackson has been removed and we will attempt to locate its owner,'' Kriseman said in a statement to the Tampa Bay Times.

WASHINGTON, D.C.

The stewards of the National Mall announced this week that the exhibit alongside the Thomas Jefferson Memorial will be updated to showcase his status as both one of the country's founders and a slaveholder. ''We can reflect the momentous contributions of someone like Thomas Jefferson, but also consider carefully the complexity of who he was,'' an official with the Trust told the Washington Examiner. ''And that's not reflected right now in the exhibits.''

New Jersey Sen. Cory Booker introduced a bill in Sept. 2017 to remove Confederate statues from the U.S. Capitol Building.

The National Cathedral voted that same month to take down two stained-glass windows of Confederate generals. The removal could take a few days and workers seen putting up scaffolding around the windows to start the process-

Florida Gov. Rick Scott, a Republican, signed a bill to replace a statue of a Confederate general at the U.S. Capitol with one of Mary McLeod Bethune, a black woman who founded a school that became BethuneCookman University in Daytona Beach, Florida. She'll become the first black female to be honored in Statuary Hall.

WORTHINGTON, OHIO

Worthington removed a historic marker Aug. 18 outside the former home of a Confederate general.

[From the Huffington Post, Aug. 23, 2017]

POLLS FIND LITTLE SUPPORT FOR CONFEDERATE STATUE REMOVAL—BUT HOW YOU ASK MATTERS

(By Ariel Edwards-Levy)

Americans are generally unsupportive of attempts to remove memorials honoring Confederate leaders, new polling shows—although the way the question is framed may make a significant difference.

In a new HuffPost/YouGov poll, a third of Americans favor removing statues and memorials of Confederate leaders, with 49 percent opposed. Just 29 percent of Americans favor changing the names of streets, schools and buildings commemorating Confederate leaders, while half are opposed.

Those surveyed are effectively split on whether the Confederate flag is more a symbol of Southern pride (36 percent) or racism (35 percent), with the rest unsure or saying it represents neither. But even if Americans don't overwhelmingly recognize the flag as a symbol of racism, there's also little widespread enthusiasm for its use. Just 34 percent of Americans say they approve of displaying the Confederate flag in public, while 47 percent disapprove.

Opinions on the Confederate memorials are divided along racial lines, but to an even greater degree along political ones. Black Americans are 18 percentage points likelier than white Americans to favor removing statues of Confederate leaders—but the gap between Democrats and Republicans on the question is 46 points. And the difference between Hillary Clinton voters and those who supported President Donald Trump in last year's election is a full 58 points.

Within the Democratic Party, white and black people are about equally likely to favor removing the statues: 64 percent and 63 percent, respectively, say they'd like to see them taken down. There are differences, however, by ideology among the party's members—77 percent of self-described liberal Democrats, but just 40 percent of self-described moderates or conservatives—want to see the statues removed.

Most other surveys released in the past few weeks find at best modest support for removing Confederate memorials, although two distinctively-worded questions stand out in these results.

The strongest support for keeping memorials in place came in the poll conducted by Marist for NPR and PBS NewsHour, which gave respondents a choice between letting statues ''remain as a historical symbol'' and removing them ''because they are offensive to some people.'' (Arguably, the question might have been better balanced had the first option been written as ''because some people view them as a historical symbol.'')

The only poll to find majority support for removing some monuments, conducted by the Democratic firm Public Policy Polling, adopted a framework far more sympathetic to the monuments' opponents, asking about their ''relocation'' rather than their ''removal.''

PPP found voters split—39 percent to 34 percent—on whether they ''support or oppose monuments honoring the Confederacy.'' But those voters were largely willing to relocate Confederate monuments if the issue was instead presented as an attempt to move them ''to museums or other historic sites where they can be viewed in proper historical context.'' Unlike other questions, PPP also asked specifically about memorials on government property, rather than a broader question about public spaces.

Opinions surrounding Confederate symbols have also proved to be fairly mutable in response to current events. After a white supremacist killed nine members of a black church in Charleston, South Carolina, two years ago, support for the Confederate flag dropped quickly and significantly.

That doesn't appear to have happened yet following the violence earlier this month in Charlottesville, Virginia, sparked by a white nationalist rally opposing efforts to remove a statue of Confederate Gen. Robert E. Lee. But if the issue remains a flashpoint in the days to come, its prominence could possibly polarize views even further than they already are. (Charlottesville on Wednesday draped black shrouds over the Lee statue and one for Confederate Gen. Thomas ''Stonewall'' Jackson.)

Since Trump took office, Democrats have repeatedly rallied around opinions that serve as anti-Trump shibboleths, expressing sharply increased alarm about global warming, mistrust of Russia and support for immigration. While Democrats are already generally in favor of taking down the Confederate statues, their level of support for doing so ranges between 45 percent and 72 percent in recent surveys—far lower than the party's almost unanimous dislike for the president.

———

[From the Federalist, June 12, 2020]

ABOLITIONIST MONUMENTS DEFACED BY ANTI-RACISM' RIOTERS IS WHAT TEACHING FAKE HISTORY GETS AMERICA

(By Joy Pullmann)

The imagery couldn't be more direct. Across the nation, rioting and unrest that has killed black Americans and destroyed black neighborhoods has included the defacement of historic monuments, including those to abolitionists.

The last wave of monument destruction, in 2017, largely focused on Confederates and slave holders, erasing all the accomplishments of figures such as George Washington and Thomas Jefferson with a scarlet S, for slave-holder. This time, the ignorance has descended even further.

The rioters are now tearing down and defacing memorials wantonly, apparently assuming that if someone is being celebrated that person is ''probably a racist,'' as the image below says.

This prejudiced ignorance appears to be widespread, and unchecked by local authorities. Several of the defaced monuments are of abolitionists, including the Great Emancipator Abraham Lincoln, as Tristan Justice reported Thursday. For example:

''[I]n Boston, demonstrators also vandalized a monument to the 54th Massachusetts regiment, the second all-black volunteer regiment of the Union Army,'' Justice writes.'' . . . Add to the growing list of civil rights freedom fighters defaced by social justice protestors a Minnesota memorial to three black men who were lynched in 1920 following false rape accusations from a white woman.''

These mob actions are not the result of accidental ignorance, but of cultivated prejudice. One month ago, I collected just a few pieces of evidence pointing in this direction:

A 2019 poll found . . . that ''more than 80 percent of Americans ages 39 and younger could not say what rights the First Amendment protects, and three-quarters or more couldn't name any authors of The Federalist Papers.'' Another 2019 poll found ''just 57 percent of millennials believe the Declaration of Independence 'better guarantees freedom and equality' than the Communist Manifesto.'' A 2016 Federalist article notes, ''40 percent of recent grads were unaware that Congress has the right to declare war and 10 percent think Judge Judy is on the Supreme Court.''

In February, I presented more such evidence:

Today, 4 in 10 Americans who are younger than 39 disagree that the United States ''has a history we should be proud of,'' according to a 2019 poll by FLAG/YouGov. The poll also found that half of all Americans agree the United States is a sexist and racist country, including two-thirds of millennials. Millennials showed the lowest level of agreement with the statement, ''I'm proud to be an American.'' Thirty-eight percent of ''younger Americans do not agree that 'America has a history that we should be proud of,'' according to the poll. 2019's annual poll from the Victims of Communism Memorial Foundation found that 37 percent of millennials think the United States is ''among the most unequal societies in the world.''

The anti-American group of recent graduates is not a fringe element. It is a substantial and ominously growing group of voting-age adults.

The recent riots have given us many more indications that America's education institutions do not merely keep kids ignorant, but actively teach them to hate their country. Just refer to any of the emails and website banners you've been subjected to from every company you've ever purchased from online, detailing about how they're all ''fighting racism'' by frantically donating to people and organizations that make a living off heightened racial tensions.

These messages reveal that the nation's leadership class has all been re-educated extremely successfully to believe a pack of things that just aren't true about American history and ideals. They are well-catechized in what is billed as antiracist attitudes and activities that are rooted in false information and more likely to instead increase racial tensions.

Hardly a one of them, or any other American, can tell you much about George Washington besides he was a slave owner. Hardly

one of them can identify Woodrow Wilson and Franklin Delano Roosevelt as bona fide, deep-dyed racists. Not one of them know one of the first acts of Congress—the Congress that existed before today's Congress, the one that pre-dates the Constitution—was to pass a massive document outlawing slavery in territory newly acquired from Great Britain during postwar negotiations.

But they all have heard of Audre Lorde, whose great contribution to society is basically being black and gay. They are all up on movies directed by black women like Ava DuVernay and books by pathos-filled but fact-challenged black writers like Ta-Nehisi Coates. They all know Michael Brown put his hands up and said ''Don't shoot'' even though he didn't. They're passing around discredited fake history like The New York Times's 1619 Project as if it were accurate, and using it to justify supporting totalitarian thought policing because a black guy says this will solve racism.

These people's heads aren't empty. Their hate isn't blind. It's very well-formed. And it's been deliberately aimed at the very country that has paid for and overseen their indoctrination into political violence.

I've now spent about a decade tracking information like this, and have researched and written about it in more detail than most, and therefore can assure you there is much more to find. Entire books have and could be written to detail more. Each generation of American children has learned less real history than the generation before it. Each generation of American children has instead been subject to greater levels of indoctrination in place of genuine education. The alarms have been sounded for decades, even a century, and nothing effective has been done.

So now we have riots and unfettered monument smashing. This is no accident. It is a logical consequence of convincing ourselves, against all evidence, that America's public education institutions are largely sound outside a few crazies who never happen to be in one's own school district, and even if they were, one's own children would of course be impervious. Not like their stupid dupes of classmates, who in just a few short years will go on to vote and tear down monuments to American abolitionists in the name of anti-racism.

This is what happens when conservatives spend 120 years complaining about the left controlling academia while the politicians conservatives vote for and cheerily profile in our publications keep increasing funding for these intellectual enemies of our country. Seventy years later, God and man are still objects of scorn at Yale, and so is our nation, but still we keep sending them our kids and money, hiring their graduates to teach our children and rule us, and funding their students.

The postwar convention of Minnesota niceness in politics has been a disaster. That's because cowardice ultimately is not nice. It leaves the innocent and the vulnerable defenseless. And, as with Stockholm Syndrome, some of the preyed upon ultimately turn predator themselves after identifying too strongly with their captors.

How many more statues and American minds have to get smashed before people who genuinely love their country gain the courage to start fighting effectively for her restoration before it's too late? Here's part of what that would look like: Civil authorities first stopping vandalism and pursuing the vandals to mete out their just, legally determined penalties; second, politicians who claim to love America fighting for her by refusing to send public funds to institutions that fail to prove their graduates honor the country that pays for their education. At this point, that's just about all of them.

It's time for a new, non-racist boycott, divest, sanction movement—for taxpayer-funded education. Liberate public funds from these institutions with a century-long record of failure. Return it to families. At least half of them will be delighted to choose proAmerica schools. That's a lot more than pick proAmerica schools now. It would give this country a chance to strive toward its ideals once more rather than burn them in chaos.

[From the Federalist, Aug. 17, 2017]

HERE'S A LIST OF ALL THE MONUMENTS LIBERALS WANT TO TEAR DOWN SO FAR

(BY BRE PAYTON)

In the wake of the violence that took place in Charlottesville over last weekend, numerous activists and politicians have called for the destruction of more historical monuments, although a significant majority of Americans (62 percent) think the monuments should stay put. Only 27 percent of Americans think these statues should be removed for fear of offending some people. As usual, public opinion's not stopping liberals from pursuing an unpopular agenda.

Though by no means comprehensive, here's a list of the monuments that are facing calls for removal or have already been torn down.

1. THE JEFFERSON MEMORIAL IN WASHINGTON DC

In a PBS interview, Al Sharpton called for the Jefferson Memorial in Washington DC to be abandoned because the third president of the United States and author of the Declaration of Independence was a slave owner.

2. STATUES IN THE CAPITOL

Rep. Nancy Pelosi (D–Calif.) and Sen. Cory Booker (D–N.J.) have both called for statues commemorating Confederates to be removed from the U.S. Capitol.

3. MOUNT RUSHMORE

Vice News's Wilbert L. Cooper called for Mount Rushmore to be destroyed because the U.S. presidents whose visages are carved into the mountainside are problematic by today's standards.

4. MONUMENTS IN BALTIMORE

Baltimore Mayor Catherine Pugh had Civil War monuments removed from the city in the cover of night, without any public hearings or any public discussion process. Pugh told The New York Times that she used her emergency powers as mayor to take down statues of Robert E. Lee and Stonewall Jackson from a public park—surprising even some members of the city council.

Maryland Gov. Larry Hogan also called for a statue memorializing Roger B. Taney, a Supreme Court justice who penned the infamous Dred Scott decision. which determined that anyone descended from a slave could not be an American citizen, be removed from the pedestal where it had been erected since 1887.

5. STONE MOUNTAIN

Democratic gubernatorial candidate Stacey Abrams called for a frieze depicting Confederate soldiers to be removed from Stone Mountain in Georgia.

6. ALBERT PIKE STATUE IN WASHINGTON DC

In Washington DC, a group of protestors gathered on Sunday to call for the statue of Albert Pike, a Confederate general, to be torn down.

7. CHICAGO PARKS NAMED AFTER WASHINGTON AND JACKSON

A Chicago pastor has asked the mayor to remove the names of two former presidents—George Washington and Andrew Jackson—from city parks because both men owned slaves.

8. CONFEDERATE SOLDIERS MONUMENT IN DURHAM, NORTH CAROLINA

The Confederate Soldiers Monument was torn down by protesters from its spot in front of the old Durham County Courthouse on Monday. Four have been arrested in connection to this instance of vandalism. The Workers World Party released a statement claiming that it should be their right to tear the monuments down.

9. MONUMENTS THROUGHOUT THE STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA

North Carolina Gov. Roy Cooper has called for additional monuments to be torn down and is asking the state legislature to repeal a 2015 law that prevents the destruction of Civil War monuments.

10. MONUMENTS THROUGHOUT THE STATE OF VIRGINIA

In a statement released Wednesday afternoon, Virginia Gov. Terry McAuliffe is asking state legislators and city officials to tear down monuments throughout the Old Dominion.

11. 'OLD JOE' STATUE IN GAINESVILLE, FLORIDA

In Gainesville, Florida, a statue of a Confederate soldier was removed Monday from outside a county administrative building.

12. STATUES IN LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY

The City Council of Lexington, Kentucky voted unanimously on Tuesday to remove Confederate statues from the lawn in front of an old county courthouse. In response, a white nationalist group is reportedly planning a protest.

13. STATUES IN LOUISVILLE, KENTUCKY

On Monday, protesters gathered in favor of removing a statue of Civil War officer John B. Castleman from Louisville, Kentucky.

14. STATUES IN NASHVILLE TENNESSEE, INCLUDING ONE ON PRIVATE PROPERTY

In Nashville, Tennessee, protestors gathered to call for the removal of a monument depicting Nathan Bedford Forrest, a lieutenant in the Confederate army, from the state capitol on Monday. People have also called for a memorial of Forrest, which sits on private property, to be hidden from view of the nearby highway.

15. TWO STATUES VANDALIZED IN WILMINGTON, NORTH CAROLINA

''A white flag was hung on the gun of the statue and its head and feet were spray painted,'' WECT reports. ''Officers were called back to the scene and found a rope tied to the statue's neck. Upon examination, officers said they believe it was likely tied to a vehicle in an attempt to pull the statue over.'' Another statue was marked with graffiti.

16. A CEMETERY MARKER IN LOS ANGELES

A statue that stood in the Confederate section of Hollywood Forever Cemetery for more than 90 years was toppled on Wednesday, Los Angeles Times reports. A plaque commemorating Jefferson Davis was also removed from a park this week.

Mr. BIGGS. Madam Speaker, I will say that as we go forward, if we continue to denigrate all police officers because of a few police officers, if we denigrate all of our society because of a few in our society, we will see this Nation, the ideals of individual freedom, erased from this Earth.

I used to do work at multilateral institutions and at the United Nations, and I will tell you this: This country, to me, is special and unique; imperfect, but the idea, the ideals, the people who have gone before us, how can we erase what they have done? Some made magnificent sacrifices that we might enjoy the freedoms we enjoy today, and yet they were wrong on other issues in their lives.

How can we erase our history? We must face our history squarely and openly and build upon that history to the great promise of the ideals of this Nation if we are going to persist as a Nation.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

JUNE IS LGBTQ PRIDE MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, and still I rise.

I am here for a special purpose, and I shall not deviate from the cause that has brought me to this podium tonight, but I do assure you there are things that have been said that at an appropriate time, I will respond to.

Tonight, I rise to call to the attention of this House H. Res. 1014, Encouraging the celebration of the month of June as LGBTQ Pride Month.

Madam Speaker, I want to thank the many original cosponsors of this resolution. There are 60. I would like to thank the Human Rights Campaign for the work that it has done to help us construct this resolution. I would like to thank the Center for Transgender Equality, the Equality Caucus, and Dignity Houston.

I rise tonight because 51 years ago, the Stonewall riots in New York heralded in the beginning of the end of a shameful period in our history, because 51 years ago, Madam Speaker, in June 1969, police raided The Stonewall Inn, a gay bar in Greenwich Village, New York, causing a civil uprising and clashes between the police and thousands of protesters.

Those historic events catalyzed a generation of activists who birthed a civil rights movement for LGBTQ equality.

I rise tonight because I am an ally of the LGBTQ-plus community.

I rise tonight because I didn't get here by myself. There were people of all stripes who made it possible for me to stand here in the House of Representatives.

I rise tonight because 51 years ago being gay, lesbian, bisexual, or transgender was illegal in most States in this country. Another way of putting it is this: It was illegal to be who you were in this country.

Fifty-one years ago, no Federal or State laws existed to secure the rights of lesbian and gay people to live openly in a relationship with their partner.

Fifty-one years ago, no law precluded even the most overt discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation or gender identity.

Fifty-one years ago, our legal system afforded LGBTQ-plus persons no protections under the law to live free from discrimination in employment, in housing, in finance, in education, or in healthcare.

I rise tonight because 51 years ago, there were few openly gay politicians or public figures in this country.

I am honored to say that the Honorable Barney Frank, whom I served with in Congress, has been and continues to be a part of this resolution. Each resolution that I have sponsored has honored the Honorable Barney Frank, a Member of Congress from 1981 to 2013, and recognized him as an honorary cosponsor of this resolution.

I rise because 51 years ago, being openly gay was a finable offense, a crime, in many Federal agencies and a per se bar to obtaining a Federal security clearance.

But today, thanks to the resolution and thanks to the revolution that began this month 51 years ago at Stonewall, I am proud to say that several openly gay persons serve proudly on my congressional staff. I am proud to have them, and I am proud of the work they do.

Today, I am even more proud that as of last Monday, when the Supreme Court decided Bostock v. Clayton County, each member of my staff and all LGBTQ persons in the United States of America now enjoy the same legal protections against employment discrimination as all other persons without regard to sex, sexual orientation, or gender identity.

In that historic 6–3 decision, the Bostock court resoundingly affirmed that the prohibitions of Title VII bar all discrimination in employment on the basis of sex, including sexual orientation or gender identity.

Today, we recall the painful, bloody, and often deadly toll of the 51 formative years between Stonewall and Bostock.

Today, we remember each LGBTQ-plus victim of discrimination, violence, and prejudice in the intervening years—51 years, I might add—who were shut out, subjugated, or even killed.

Today, we mourn each one of the Black transgender women who have been murdered in this year alone.

And today, with consideration of this Pride resolution, we continue the tradition that I began as an original sponsor of Congress' Pride Month resolution.

I am proud of how far we have come as a Nation in our struggle for full LGBTQ-plus equality. And in this season of Pride, it is fitting to celebrate that remarkable hard-won progress.

□ 1830

But today, I also recognize that, although we have come a long way in 51 years, we still have far to go. Today, we must ensure that full inclusion for LGBTQ-plus persons does not take another 51 years or even 51 weeks. It is now time that we must complete the march toward full legal equality for all persons, without regard to sexual orientation or gender identity.

Today, I call upon the Senate to take up and pass the Equality Act, H.R. 5, without further delay. I am proud to be the original sponsor of this resolution. I am grateful to all who have become original cosponsors. It is not too late for persons to cosponsor the resolution, and I would beg that persons would do so.

So now, having finished my comments on the Pride Month resolution, I would like to step over to the next microphone.

VALUING ORDER AND LAW INSTEAD OF LAW AND ORDER

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise because now I must say it was most difficult to sit in this House and hear some of the comments made by my colleagues tonight. They seem to value statues above human life.

All the vandalism and crimes that have been committed, I don't support that, and I don't think that the protesters who were out there peacefully protesting supported it either.

I don't think you ought to paint all protesters with one brush, just as I don't paint all peace officers with one brush. I never conclude that all officers are bad, but those who are bad ought to be punished.

I find it quite fascinating that my colleagues who came here and spoke so eloquently tonight, I haven't heard them on the floor in prior times talking about all of the atrocities being committed against people of color at the hands of the constabulary. I just question why is it that they don't come to the floor and stand up for people of color.

I stand up for all people. It doesn't matter your color, your sex, your sexual orientation. I have been on this floor consistently doing this, but I don't see that from the other side.

I see them here for what I call order and law, not law and order, and here is how that works: You have a President who goes before members of the police community, and he says to them: When you arrest a person, you don't have to be so nice.

Now, he is talking about a person who is in the care, custody, and control of the police, and that person does not have to be treated so nice.

He sent a message. That message was, you maintain order, do whatever you have got to do, and I will provide the law to support you. That is order and law.

I support law and order. I have an uncle who was a deputy sheriff. He influenced my life. I am probably in Congress today because of words that he spoke to me, so I support policing. I understand the necessity to have persons who are going to assure us that we can be protected.

But what I don't support is a belief that peaceful protesters are all somehow a part of a mob. You can peacefully protest and go to jail. I know; I have been there. I was there with the Honorable JOHN LEWIS. We were peacefully protesting, but we went to jail.

Peaceful protesters go to jail. Peaceful protesters get in the way. Peaceful protesters disrupt. That is what protest

is about. If people don't get uncomfortable, then your protest has accomplished very little.

Dr. King was in jail when he wrote the letter from the Birmingham jail. He was peacefully protesting, but he went to jail. It happens. That is a part of the protest movement.

When I went out to protest, knowing that I would likely go to jail, I had somebody to post my bail.

Peaceful protest does not mean that you are not disruptive. It means that you have a message that has to be heard. As Dr. King put it, protests can be the language of the unheard, peaceful protest especially.

So I am here to say to my colleagues, I regret that you cannot see the hurt that is being felt by people of color.

I don't understand why my tax dollars have to support a statue along some thoroughfare of Robert E Lee. You can have it. Take it to a museum. Tuck it away for whatever purposes you like. But you don't have to impose it upon me.

We don't allow—or, more appropriately, Germany does not have statues of Hitler in the public squares. And I refuse to stand by and allow statues of people who wanted to keep my ancestors in chains, in slavery, which is a nice way of saying rape, murder, kidnapping, stripping babies from their parents, and sending the parents one way and the children another. It is too nice a word for what happened to my ancestors.

So, I am not going to celebrate them. I have never celebrated them, and it is time to remove them.

I am not going to go out and pull one over and push it off into some corner. But I don't see my colleagues helping with the means by which they can be removed, and you take them and put them wherever you would like to have them. I have no problem with your ownership of them, but don't expect me to celebrate them and have my tax dollars take care of them.

There was one in my congressional district, a Confederate soldier named Dowling. It has been removed, and I am proud to know that was removed.

So I rise now, as I close, to say just simply this: I love my country. I love my country. I love it because of many of the good things that have happened to me. But I also love it in spite of many of the things that were not appropriate that have occurred. And I will continue to love my country.

But I refuse to accept symbols of racism and hate. I will never honor them, and I would badly have my colleagues take them to some other place out of the public square.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

ADJOURNMENT

THE SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 4(b) of House Resolution 967, the House stands adjourned until 9 a.m. on Monday, June 29, 2020, for morning-hour debate, and 10 a.m. for legislative business.

Thereupon (at 6 o'clock and 38 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, June 29, 2020, at 9 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

4586. A letter from the OSD FRLO, Office of the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Civilian Employment and Reemployment Rights for Service Members, Former Service Members and Applicants of the Uniformed Services [Docket ID: DOD-2019-OS-0132] (RIN: 0790-AK93) received June 11, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Armed Services.

4587. A letter from the OSD Federal Register Liaison Officer, Office of the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — DoD Guidance Documents [Docket ID: DoD-2020-OS-0019] (RIN: 0790-AK97) received June 11, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Armed Services.

4588. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's interim final rule — Eligibility of Students at Institutions of Higher Education for Funds under the Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security (CARES) Act, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

4589. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Oxathiapiprolin; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2019-0128; FRL-10009-93] received June 11, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4590. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Indaziflam; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2020-0045; FRL-10008-92] received June 11, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4591. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Bacillus thuringiensis Cry14Ab-1 Protein in Soybean; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2019-0097; FRL-10008-72] received June 11, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4592. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval of Air Quality Implementation Plans; New Jersey; Gasoline Vapor Recovery Requirements [EPA-R02-OAR-2019-0399; FRL-10009-52-Region 2] received June 11, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4593. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval of Air Quality Implementation Plans; California; Ventura County; 8-Hour Ozone Nonattainment Area Requirements [EPA-R09-OAR-2018-0146; FRL-10009-22-Region 9] received June 11, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4594. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of State Plans for Designated Facilities and Pollutants; Virginia; Emission Standards for Existing Municipal Solid Waste Landfills [EPA-R03-OAR-2019-0537; FRL-10004-07-Region 3] received June 11, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4595. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; State of Utah; Revisions to the Utah Division of Administrative Rules; R307-101-3 [EPA-R08-OAR-2019-0688; FRL-10010-35-Region 8] received June 11, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4596. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; North Dakota; Revisions to Permitting Rules [EPA-R08-OAR-2019-0689; FRL-10010-33-Region 8] received June 11, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4597. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Maryland; Infrastructure Requirements for the 2010 Sulfur Dioxide National Ambient Air Quality Standard [EPA-R03-OAR-2018-0042; FRL-10009-54-Region 3] received June 11, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4598. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Quality State Implementation Plans; Approvals and Promulgations: Montana; Columbia Falls, Kalispell and Libby PM10 Nonattainment Area Limited Maintenance Plan and Redesignation Request [EPA-R08-OAR-2019-0690; FRL-10010-18-Region 8] received June 11, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4599. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Wisconsin; Second Maintenance Plans for 1997 Ozone NAAQS; Door County, Kewaunee County, Manitowoc County and Milwaukee-Racine Area [EPA-R05-OAR-2019-0699; FRL-10009-87-Region 5] received June 11, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4600. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Clean Water Act Section 401 Certification Rule [EPA-HQ-OW-2019-0405; FRL-10009-80-OW] (RIN: 2040-AF86) received June 11, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C.

801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DEFAZIO: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 2. A bill to authorize funds for Federal-aid highways, highway safety programs, and transit programs, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 116–437). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Ms. ADAMS (for herself, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. COOPER, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. CLAY, and Ms. NORTON):

H.R. 7380. A bill to cancel the obligation of historically black colleges and universities to repay certain capital financing loans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BANKS (for himself, Mr. ROY, Mr. BUDD, and Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina):

H.R. 7381. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to include a penalty for the destruction of a memorial of a constitutional leader, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWN of Maryland (for himself, Mr. WALTZ, Mr. VELA, and Mr. CISNEROS):

H.R. 7382. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Defense to prescribe regulations that grant constructive credit towards retirement for a member of the reserve components of the Armed Forces who cannot complete minimum annual training requirements due to cancellation or other extenuating circumstance arising from the COVID-19 pandemic; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. BROWNLEY of California:

H.R. 7383. A bill to direct the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct a study regarding women involuntarily separated or discharged from the Armed Forces due to pregnancy or parenthood, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CHABOT:

H.R. 7384. A bill to reform policing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONNOLLY:

H.R. 7385. A bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to Edwin Cole ''Ed'' Bearss, in recognition of his contributions to preservation of American Civil War history and continued efforts to bring our Nation's history alive for new generations through his interpretive storytelling; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. FINKENAUER (for herself, Mrs. AXNE, and Mr. LOEBSACK):

H.R. 7386. A bill to ensure that federally-backed financing for the construction, rehabilitation, or purchase of manufactured home communities is available only for communities whose owner has implemented minimum consumer protections in the lease agreements with residents of all manufactured home communities owned by such owner, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL (for herself, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. CASE, Mr. HUFFMAN, and Mr. GRIJALVA):

H.R. 7387. A bill to require the Secretary of Commerce to establish a grant program to benefit coastal habitats, resiliency, and the economy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PETERSON (for himself and Mr. KATKO):

H.R. 7388. A bill to amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 to provide for the release of certain Federal interests in connection with certain grants under that Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. PRESSLEY:

H.R. 7389. A bill to direct the Secretary of Transportation to carry out a grant program to support efforts to provide fare-free transit service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Miss RICE of New York:

H.R. 7390. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to add to matters covered by counseling in the Transition Assistance Program; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. SHERRILL (for herself, Mr. KEVIN HERN of Oklahoma, and Mr. SCHRADER):

H.R. 7391. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to remove certain geographic and originating site restrictions on the furnishing of telehealth services under the Medicare program; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. SLOTKIN (for herself, Mr. GARAMENDI, and Mr. TURNER):

H.R. 7392. A bill to direct the Secretary of Defense to publicly disclose the results of Department of Defense testing for perfluoroalkyl or polyfluoroalkyl substances, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. SPANBERGER (for herself, Mr. BACON, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. TONKO, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. HARDER of California, and Mr. KATKO):

H.R. 7393. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to develop a program to reduce barriers to entry for farmers, ranchers, and private forest landowners in certain private markets, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. THOMPSON of California:

H.R. 7394. A bill to establish a temporary voluntary program for support of insurers providing business interruption insurance coverage during the COVED-19 pandemic, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. VAN DREW (for himself and Mr. TIPTON):

H.R. 7395. A bill to require flags of the United States of America to be domestically made, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WALKER:

H.R. 7396. A bill to increase access to agency guidance documents; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. CLAY:

H. Res. 1025. A resolution expressing support for the designation of June as ''National Homeownership Month'', honoring the critical importance of increased homeownership to overall affordable housing goals, and acknowledging the necessity of using comprehensive resources within the legislative and policy toolbox, together with vital public-private partnerships, to allow communities across the United States to provide access to safe and secure housing for all Americans, regardless of income level, while promoting diversity consistent with the ideal of the American Dream during the time of the COVID-19 pandemic; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. GRIFFITH (for himself, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. BIGGS, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. CLINE, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. WEBER of Texas, and Mr. BUDD):

H. Res. 1026. A resolution expressing the sense of Congress that responses to the COVID-19 pandemic by the education system must be narrowly tailored to protect the well-being of children in different parts of the country; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN (for herself, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. NORTON, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. TONKO, Ms. MOORE, Mr. MCEACHIN, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. TLAIB, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Ms. PINGREE, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. LOWENTHAL, and Ms. OMAR):

H. Res. 1027. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the wrongs and hardships of Black women are often equal to those experienced by Black men yet receive less attention and justice, and that any legislation passed in the House of Representatives to remedy racial inequities in the United States, especially those present in the criminal justice system, must include reforms to address concerns for Black women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

176. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Senate of the State of Michigan, relative to Senate Resolution No. 122, to unequivocally condemn and denounce the violent actions of extremist organizations as unacceptable and to memorialize the Congress of the United States to redouble its efforts, using all available and appropriate tools, to combat the spread of all forms of domestic terrorism; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements, are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Ms. ADAMS:
H.R. 7380.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8
By Mr. BANKS:
H.R. 7381.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress).
By Mr. BROWN of Maryland:
H.R. 7382.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Necessary and Proper Clause (Art. 1, Sec. 8, Cl. 18)
By Ms. BROWNLEY of California:
H.R. 7383.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution
By Mr. CHABOT:
H.R. 7384.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution of the United States, that Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; and
Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution of the United States to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.
By Mr. CONNOLLY:
H.R. 7385.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.
By Ms. FINKENAUER:
H.R. 7386.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.
By Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL:
H.R. 7387.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8 of the US Constitution
By Mr. PETERSON:
H.R. 7388.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8
By Ms. PRESSLEY:
H.R. 7389.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1, and Clause 18
By Miss RICE of New York:
H.R. 7390.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8
By Ms. SHERRILL:
H.R. 7391.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Clause 18 of Section 8 of Article 1 of the Constitution of the United States of America.
By Ms. SLOTKIN:
H.R. 7392.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8, Necessary and Proper Clause: ''To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.''
By Ms. SPANBERGER:
H.R. 7393.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution
By Mr. THOMPSON of California:
H.R. 7394.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1
By Mr. VAN DREW:
H.R. 7395.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
U.S. Constitution, Article 1, Section 8, cl. 2 ''To regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes;''
By Mr. WALKER:
H.R. 7396.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 1, Clause 1; Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18; and Article 1, Section 9, Clause 7

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 2: Mr. PALLONE, Mr. NEAL, Ms. WATERS, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. RYAN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. WELCH, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. MALINOWSKI, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. SHALALA, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mrs. HAYES, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. BEYER, Mr. SIRES, Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL, Mr. PAPPAS, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. SABLAN, Ms. CRAIG, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. TRONE, Mr. HORSFORD, Mr. ROUDA, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. PASCRELL, Mrs. TRAHAN, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. TONKO, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. MORELLE, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. EVANS, Ms. FRANKEL, Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas, Mr. SUOZZI, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. LUJÁN, Ms. DEAN, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. BONAMICI, Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. UNDERWOOD, Mr. HECK, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. PLASKETT, Ms. WILD, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. MOORE, Mr. CISNEROS, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. SHERRILL, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. Mfume, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. CASTEN of Illinois, Mr. RUSH, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. CASE, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. PORTER, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. KIM, Mr. NORCROSS, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. ALLRED, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. VELA, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. HIMES, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. STANTON, Mr. CORREA, Ms. HAALAND, Mr. MCEACHIN, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. VEASEY, and Mr. LAMB.
H.R. 414: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 592: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
H.R. 692: Mr. CRENSHAW.
H.R. 732: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. NEGUSE, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. KILMER, and Mr. LUJÁN.
H.R. 1383: Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 1407: Ms. TORRES SMALL of New Mexico, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. HILL of Arkansas, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. UPTON, Mr. GRIFFITH, and Mr. FLEISCHMANN.
H.R. 1507: Mr. PASCRELL.
H.R. 1574: Ms. OMAR.
H.R. 1787: Ms. ESCOBAR.
H.R. 1834: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 2041: Mr. FOSTER.
H.R. 2074: Mrs. BEATTY.
H.R. 2086: Mr. RIGGLEMAN, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. COLE, Mr. ARMSTRONG, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
H.R. 2168: Ms. MENG.
H.R. 2337: Mrs. HAYES.
H.R. 2610: Mr. HUDSON.
H.R. 2611: Mr. LUJÁN.
H.R. 2767: Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mrs. TRAHAN, and Mr. KATKO.
H.R. 3121: Mr. KATKO.
H.R. 3297: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 3354: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
H.R. 3393: Mr. MASSIE.
H.R. 3394: Mr. PALLONE, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. ESHOO, and Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 3572: Mr. POCAN, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. HAALAND, Mr. MOULTON, and Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 3637: Mr. TONKO.
H.R. 3835: Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER.
H.R. 4004: Mr. VEASEY and Mr. KENNEDY.
H.R. 4064: Mr. TAKANO.
H.R. 4179: Mr. GRIJALVA and Mr. MCNERNEY.
H.R. 4535: Mr. EMMER.
H.R. 4679: Mr. GOLDEN.
H.R. 4932: Ms. GABBARD, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. LEVIN of California, Mr. ALLRED, Mr. TONKO, and Mr. TRONE.
H.R. 5002: Mr. VAN DREW and Mr. PAPPAS.
H.R. 5050: Mr. TED LIEU of California.
H.R. 5269: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.
H.R. 5297: Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia.
H.R. 5312: Mr. MORELLE and Mr. LYNCH.
H.R. 5325: Mr. ROUDA.
H.R. 5481: Mrs. HARTZLER and Mr. ADERHOLT.
H.R. 5549: Mrs. LOWEY.
H.R. 5689: Mr. CASE.
H.R. 5757: Mr. CLINE.
H.R. 5761: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 5986: Mrs. BEATTY and Ms. WILSON of Florida.
H.R. 6082: Mr. BANKS.
H.R. 6109: Mr. CASTEN of Illinois.
H.R. 6197: Ms. JACKSON LEE.
H.R. 6216: Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma.
H.R. 6417: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 6487: Mr. DESAULNIER.
H.R. 6489: Mr. COX of California.
H.R. 6492: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY and Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 6495: Mr. KHANNA.
H.R. 6501: Mr. LEVIN of California.
H.R. 6581: Ms. DELAURO.
H.R. 6637: Mr. RYAN, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. COX of California, Ms. FRANKEL, Mr. SUOZZI, and Ms. CRAIG.
H.R. 6691: Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia.
H.R. 6723: Mr. HORSFORD and Mr. HARDER of California.
H.R. 6728: Mr. NEWHOUSE.
H.R. 6742: Mr. CRENSHAW and Mr. WITTMAN.
H.R. 6744: Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois and Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 6761: Ms. WILD.
H.R. 6765: Mr. VAN DREW.
H.R. 6821: Mr. LAHOOD and Mr. KELLY of Mississippi.
H.R. 6822: Mr. BACON, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mrs. LURIA.
H.R. 6829: Mr. STANTON, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. LUJÁN, and Mr. HASTINGS.
H.R. 6841: Mr. BANKS.
H.R. 6852: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. PRESSLEY, and Ms. TLAIB.
H.R. 6866: Mr. KHANNA.
H.R. 6902: Ms. DELAURO, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. BEYER, and Ms. DEAN.
H.R. 6908: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 6956: Mr. NEWHOUSE.
H.R. 7027: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. CROW, Ms. BARRAGÁN, and Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.
H.R. 7072: Mr. KATKO and Mrs. RODGERS of Washington.
H.R. 7092: Mrs. TORRES of California, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. LONG, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Ms. HOULAHAN, Mr. HARDER of California, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Mr. CICILLINE, and Ms. ESHOO.
H.R. 7106: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 7111: Mr. BUCHANAN.
H.R. 7151: Mr. HURD of Texas.
H.R. 7196: Mrs. HAYES.
H.R. 7197: Mr. CUELLAR, Ms. SCANLON, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. GOMEZ, Ms. ESCOBAR, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, and Mr. RYAN.
H.R. 7200: Ms. NORTON, Mr. PERRY, and Mr. WRIGHT.
H.R. 7214: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 7232: Ms. BROWNLEY of California and Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 7278: Mr. NORMAN.
H.R. 7285: Mr. WATKINS, Mr. GOODEN, and Mr. NORMAN.
H.R. 7289: Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. CASE, and Mr. VELA.
H.R. 7296: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
H.R. 7301: Mr. CLAY, Mr. HECK, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. VALÁZQUEZ, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Mrs. AXNE, and Mr. SAN NICOLAS.
H.R. 7308: Mr. RUSH, Mr. COOPER, Mr. MORELLE, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. BEYER, Mr. TONKO, and Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 7317: Mr. TAKANO and Mr. CICILLINE.
H.R. 7318: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 7322: Mr. CRENSHAW.
H.R. 7327: Mr. DEFAZIO and Mr. COOPER.
H.R. 7329: Mr. TIFFANY and Mr. GROTHMAN.
H.R. 7340: Mr. KHANNA.
H.R. 7341: Mr. KHANNA.
H.R. 7371: Mr. RUSH and Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.
H.R. 7372: Mr. COOK.
H.J. Res. 90: Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mr. HECK, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Ms. NORTON, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. LYNCH, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. CLAY, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Ms. DEAN, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. TRONE, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. BASS, Mr. RUSH, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. ADAMS, Ms. PORTER, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. CASTEN of Illinois, Ms. WEXTON, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. SAN NICOLAS, Mrs. AXNE, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. RYAN, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mrs. HAYES, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. TLAIB, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. HIMES, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. TONKO, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Ms. MENG, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. NEGUSE, Mr. PHILLIPS, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Mr. RICHMOND.

H. Con. Res. 20: Mr. PASCRELL.

H. Res. 974: Mr. LIPINSKI.

H. Res. 990: Ms. ADAMS, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, and Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.

H. Res. 993: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.

H. Res. 999: Mr. LEVIN of Michigan.

H. Res. 1001: Mr. HECK.

H. Res. 1013: Mr. BIGGS, Mr. BAIRD, and Mr. KING of Iowa.